DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 851 PS 008 418

AUTHOR Datta, Lois-ellin, Ed.
TITLE Toward an Evaluation Strategy for FAP-Day Care.
INSTITUTION Office of Child Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 112p.; Report of the OCD/OEO/ASPE Workshop on FAP-Day Care Evaluation (Washington, D.C., November 5-6, 1970); Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Accountability; Conference Reports; *Day Care Services; Estimated Costs; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; *Family Programs; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Program Descriptions; *Program Evaluation; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Family Assistance Plan Day Care

ABSTRACT

This report presents the findings of an invitational conference sponsored by the Office of Child Development to assess the implications of Family Assistance Plan (FAP) day care provisions from the viewpoint of program evaluation. The first section outlines the features of FAP day care, and the second section identifies accountability issues for the four major consumer groups (children, parents, staff and community). The third section presents the strategy for a 5-year evaluation plan, orders the steps to be taken, and assigns cost estimates to these projects. A summary of the basic questions involved in evaluating FAP day care is presented in section four. Three-quarters of the report is made up of appendices which include: (1) basic questions and answers concerning the proposed child care program under the Family Assistance Act (1970); (2) a working paper outlining the research accountabilities in FAP day care; (3) a list of conference participants; (4) notes and proceedings of the conference; and (5) lists of day care projects sponsored by agencies of the state and federal governments. (ED)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED 019851

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: PS CE
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. TM

TOWARD AN EVALUATION STRATEGY FOR FAP-DAY CARE

Report of the OCD/OEO/ASPE
Workshop (Nov. 5-6, 1970) on FAP-Day Care Evaluation

PS 008418

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Office of Child Development
January 1971

ERRATA

Preface, first paragraph: The last sentence should read --

"It is therefore critical that parents be involved in every stage of the way, in decisions, methods, goals and outcomes so that the day care becomes an extension of, not a substitute for, the parents' influence and responsibility."

p. 16. Last line after the footnote should read, "see also pages 92-95".

p. 22. Last line should read, "see pages 103-108", not "see Appendix F".

p. 23. Last line of footnote should read, "Appendix D-1, pages 67-102" not Appendix B.

PREFACE

The day care provisions of FAP legislation have far-reaching implications for child rearing in this country. When fully realized, FAP day care could set the stage for a generation of children reared from infancy with adequate medical, dental, and nutritional attention, in environments chosen to foster their fullest psychological development --but children whose parents no longer assume primary care-taking responsibilities. [redacted].

The Fall 1970 draft legislation appears to (a) focus on protective care and (b) involve complex systems of predicting job openings and day care slot availability, training, monitoring, and of interfacing national, regional, state and local organizations across three major government agencies.

As there are no ready parellels from current research in America, the Office of Child Development (OCD), with the support of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE) of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare held an invitational conference to assess the implications of FAP day care provisions from the viewpoint of program evaluation. The participants, all of whom donated their services, met for two days in November, 1970. Their recommendations are presented to researchers now engaged in studies of day care, and as a possible basis for coordinated Federal evaluation planning.

This document emanating from the workshop consists of three sections. The first outlines the features of FAP day care as the participants saw them. The second details those questions the participants anticipated the several audiences to which FAP day care is responsible would ask. The third presents the strategy for an evaluation plan, orders the steps to be taken, and assigns cost estimates to these projects.

Those of us at OCD who have been most involved in the conference wish to express our appreciation to the participants and to other researchers who have generously responded to our request for counsel.

Sam Granato
Sheila Sullivan

Lois-ellin Datta, Editor
Barbara Bates

I. FAP DAY CARE EXPECTATIONS AND CONCERNS

We live in a world increasingly complex, and increasingly experimental. The ever-widening edge of darkness created by our expanding control of the physical universe has brought an ever-deepening uncertainty in the social and psychological spheres. At its best this uncertainty is expressed as a willingness to acknowledge what is destructive, ineffective and inimical to human values, and to try new ways. It is an age of when "why not?" is heard more often than "why?".

In 1970, the weaknesses of the social welfare system developed in the 1930's as a new, and at that time, radical response of government to the needs of its citizens are almost catastrophically apparent. Welfare has all too often held people within poverty rather than providing roads out, roads on which men and women, and their children, can walk with dignity toward economic security and greater personal fulfillment.

The Family Assistance Act (see Appendix A) proposed by the Nixon Administration is an experimental alternative to current welfare theory and practice, an approach for which there are high expectations.

Social planners expect that provision for job training and day care will be the pivots on which the current social welfare system can be turned around from dependence on public assistance to self-sufficiency for millions of mothers with children under 14. Levinson (1970) reports that 44% of mothers now receiving some form of public assistance would like to work, if there were child care available, and moreover have the skills from previous job experience that would make the transition from home to work feasible.

While the costs of the family assistance program initially would be as high as or higher than current payments to families, it is anticipated that providing an income base, job training, and entrance into the labor market in the not too distant future can play an important role in breaking the cycle of poverty. The potential for this approach has been supported in smaller scale studies of income maintenance plans and of provision of day care services through industry. Its large-scale success will depend on many factors beyond the scope of day care per se, such as the accuracy of predicting economic needs and job openings, provision of meaningful career development ladders and adequate support for the exigencies that can reduce the employment stability of marginal families. The success of

the day care component is, however, a necessary, even though not sufficient, condition for the success of FAP: if their children are not adequately taken care of, mothers are not likely to continue to work.

Mothers are likely to expect of FAP day care continuity of service and provision of care when the child is ill, care that ensures the child's physical health and safety, care in which the child is happy, and care in which the child's development is supported. Adequate transportation and acceptable costs are important in theory; both may represent formidable problems in practice.

Child development specialists see in FAP day care the opportunity to continue on a larger-scale the great experiment that Head Start began. Day care, particularly for preschool children, can be a vehicle for providing optimum developmental experiences for children whose early environments offer little opportunity for physical and mental growth.

The child development specialists are also most likely to see the tarnished other side of the coin. Bowlby and Dennis showed the deteriorating effects of institutional child neglect, of care where psychological stimulation was inadequate during the important developmental years. Infants and very young children can least effectively protest mistreatment and can suffer from early insult for long years after. Most studies of infant day care have shown that well-conducted, high-quality programs will not harm the child's development. Comparative studies of home-reared and kibbutz-reared Israeli children (Gewirtz) substantiate this view. These studies have, it should be made clear, compared <u>good</u> child rearing at home with <u>good</u> group care, not good group care against the natural variation of child rearing in low-income homes. Such comparison might well show acceleration for children in day care. In the balance, child development experts are concerned with the short-range effects of possibly underfunded and inadequate FAP day care as well as the longer-range implications of delegation of child care from infancy throughout adolescence in a context quite different from the strong social supports of the kibbutz.

One important difference between Head Start and day care should be noted: at least initially, most FAP day care is likely to be provided in homes rather than in centers. According to Low and Spindler in 1965, there were 6.3 million mothers who had worked at least half of the prior year and who had at least one child under 14. Of the 12.3 million children of these mothers, nearly half were cared for in their own homes by relatives; 16% were cared for in someone else's home; and 13% by the mother herself. Only 2% (265,000) received group care. FAP day care offers vendor payment for three kinds of service: at

home care, group home care, and group day care. Certification of three different kinds of care, with three different cost estimates, and with different opportunities to train and supervise personnel requires a system unlike any now available; we will be learning as we go. Low and Spindler's data suggest that only a fraction (2%) of the children of employed mothers are receiving child care in certified group day care programs whose adequacy has been evaluated by a standard other than the mother's own. The quality of the other 98% has not been assessed; it is believed to range from excellent to awful with the majority of service no better than "poor".

Finding housing that meets state and local licensing requirements has been a perennial problem for potential day care center operators. Assuming that the standards will not be substantially lowered, and that except for a few experimental programs, FAP day care will not provide construction or major renovation costs, the workshop predicted that FAP group home care will serve far more children and involve more operators than in-home or center care. At present, there are few--if any--demonstration group home care projects.

The profound failures of the present welfare system make some reform imperative. A criterion for FAP of "no worse than what is happening presently" is in many ways both fair and realistic; in the longer run, however, society bears a far more demanding responsibility to all its children. All children, once born, should be cherished; they should enjoy equally security, stability, and happiness. They should have equal rights to the kind of experiences that help children grow in knowledge and in wisdom, morally strong, physically healthy, intellectually able. FAP legislation requires job training and employment for all women now on public assistance with children above six years of age. Day care services must be provided for those children whose otherwise ineligible mothers wish to participate in the program. Women who are not on welfare are demanding day care facilities for their children--in colleges and universities, in hospitals, in business. Society has long been in the position of being responsible for child development through public education: there has been less than total satisfaction with the provision society has made in public schools for low-income children. Day care for preschool children and infants finds children at a vulnerable period of their lives. Physical development, personal development and intellectual development during this period are most rapid. Extending an unequal and inferior system of child care downward will in both the short run and the long run be of little service to society.

The current FAP day care plans provide child care for women who could be trained to fill job openings in a community. The program is also required to offer many internal employment opportunities for low-

income mothers, so that FAP day care may become one of the new industries hiring the poor.

The participants believe that initially FAP day care will be custodial rather than developmental: (1) current legislation is not geared to the costs or supervisory demands of developmental care; (2) the policy of hiring neighborhood people as primary caretakers means a major preservice and inservice training effort, if even good custodial care is to be offered. Current data suggest the training and supervision needed to sustain good developmental care, even for experienced teachers, may take several years at a maximum 20:1 ratio. If most day care will be provided in group homes, hundreds of supervisors will themselves have to be trained, and they in turn will have to help the inexperienced group home day care mothers. Even with full funding support in year one, it was believed that three years or more would be required before truly developmental care would be the rule rather than the exception due to staff training problems; (3) demonstration programs currently involve early education for children attending centers or home tutoring for one child or his mother. The knowledge base for group day care home models is practically zero; extrapolation from home tutoring or Head Start-like center programs will be all we have to go on, and it seems likely that three years or more would be needed to create new models and a new knowledge base.

FAP day care eventually is to become self-supporting, moving from 100% "seed money" initial grants for the new openings for FAP day care children to as close to 0% as possible; the projects will be supported partly by fees paid by the employed mothers and partly by the government. Support will be set by the state prime grantees' cost estimates (e.g., 50¢ per meal) for the locality. Day care operators who wish to provide more than standard services will have to obtain money through other sources.

The FAP day care plan which provided the guidelines for the evaluation workshop is described in greater detail in Appendix A. The highlights of the plan are:

- Considerable organizational complexity in grant administration:

  Each state will have either a prime grantee (public or private non-profit agency) or a state welfare agency whose function is to plan the program for that state. The estimates of available jobs will come to the planning agency from the Department of Labor, which will be administering the Job Training program. Administration of the day care program may be divided between two major government agencies.

- Complex multiple responsibilities for prime grantees: Grants will be provided to the prime grantees in two phases: a planning grant of six months to one year and an operation grant made up of three accounts: administrative (grants for the one-time seed money to operators), training, and vendor payment. The prime grantee works with employment services to determine available openings and with welfare agencies to determine new slots needed, provides seed-grant money to operators, coordinates among the day care programs, is responsible for program quality through vendor certification and setting the standard cost rates, collects the fees the mothers pay into the state vendor payment account, pays the vendors from these fees plus vendor payment money, provides area-wide training for all staff of every certified program, and develops medical and dental resources.

- Sequential support of needed day care slots: The local operator will provide a three to six months plan to make available a given number of openings for FAP day care recipients. When 80% of these slots are filled, he may apply for another set of new openings. When this is 80% filled, he may apply again, until the ceiling is reached for the area as a whole. In addition to meeting prime grantee certification standards the operator must be sufficiently attractive that mothers will place their children in his care and keep them there. It is assumed that since expansion is limited until slots are filled, the parents are the ultimate monitors of the system.

- Initial estimates of support indicate that protective or custodial care will be provided: The need to train enough community people so that 85% of the staff are FAP-eligible parents indicates that a full-scale developmental approach could not be initially sustained, even if funding were provided. Experience in Head Start and other experimental preschool programs indicate that training paraprofessionals as child development specialists may require several years of intensive support. Even teachers with academic experience typically need many months of training before they can implement developmental models well. The government is encouraging a developmental rather than custodial approach through state-wide training by the prime grantee and through preparation of materials such as workbooks and guides on day care, and suggestions about alternative approaches to child development. However, funding at this time would not support equipment, staffing ratios, technical assistance, curriculum supervision, and trained personnel needed for an innovative, ambitious developmental program.

- In summary, FAP day care is a complex new system attempting to help solve a complex old problem. Its success is seen as dependent on the accuracy of job market estimates, on locally available facilities and resources, on the accuracy of the cost standards that would set the upper limits of vendor reimbursement, on the technical assistance that could be provided if certification is marginal, and on the effectiveness of the state-wide training operation.

II. CONSUMER QUESTIONS FOR THE DAY CARE COMPONENT OF THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN[1]

Introduction

When the OCD Conference was initially outlined, it was anticipated that five major groups would be asking questions requiring some form of evaluation: Congress, federal level program administrators, prime grantees and their delegates, research and evaluation personnel, and parents. At the Conference it was suggested that several other groups should be represented on this list: employers and/or unions, children, and the community. The final list settled upon was as follows:

1) Congress
2) Federal level program administrators
3) Prime grantees and their delegates
4) Employers and unions
5) Research and evaluation personnel
6) Parents and children
7) The community

Given the limitations of time and the proclivities of the participants, a limited number of the above groups were considered in depth. These were: the child (from birth to 6), parents, staff (of delegate agencies), and the community. This report will therefore focus on these interest groups, as recommendations were made only for them. The reader is referred to Appendix B for a discussion of other accountability issues expected to be raised by other interest groups.[2] Appendix B is a pre-conference working paper, but anticipated many of the issues discussed at the Conference.

I Evaluation Accountabilities to Children

In Part I, as well as other sections mentioned below, the Conference made one basic assumption: Each consumer group is granted the right to specify 1) its own goals, 2) the process by which it will arrive

---

1 Summarized by E. Robert LaCrosse, Jr., Pacific Oaks, Pasadena, California, November, 1970.

2 Evaluation Accountabilities in the Day Care Component of the Family Assistance Plan: A Working Paper. E. Robert LaCrosse, Jr., Pacific Oaks, Pasadena, California, November, 1970.

at its goals, and 3) the means by which the goals will be met. We spent a great deal of time discussing whether goals, process, and evaluation should be superimposed by government, the prime grantee, OCD and other professionals, or by parents at the local level. We decided on the above assumption for several reasons. First, we felt strongly that the local consumer, in consultation with child development and day care experts would be the best judge of what his particular community and group of children served would need. Second, we felt strongly that the decision-making process at the local level was a prime educational component of FAP day care. We realized that many mistakes would be made (as is always the case) as a day care program developed; however, only by parent and community involvement with the "permission" to learn, will a viable day care service program emerge. The people served by FAP day care, "welfare families", are typically those least listened to by society and most alienated from society. Their incorporation into the decision-making process at a real level, and their control over and responsibility for day care program provides an excellent vehicle for bringing them into the community as functioning members and, at the same time, providing them with a platform from which they may speak to the community and country at large. Further, our underlying assumption is that through the evolutionary process of developing a day care service, with the necessary community, professional, and federal coordination, all groups involved will, over time, develop programs, attitudes, and ideas which will best serve children. Ultimately, we see FAP day care, as well as FAP itself, as having impact at all levels of society. Given that, if implemented, day care on a national basis will be the most potent socializing force since compulsory schooling, we feel it critical that the consumer (parent and local community) have an important and effective voice in its implementation.

With the above in mind, we feel that it is likely that the following questions will be seen by parents, staff and the community to require evaluation from the perspective of the child from birth through preschool.

a) Nutrition
   1. Is diet nutritionally adequate?
   2. Are the non-nutritive aspects of diet adequate?

We were first concerned that children be fed well. This only reasonable in a country as rich as ours. We were further concerned, however, that those things surrounding diet be equally adequate. This includes such things as parent education as to nutrition, meal time atmosphere, the use of food preparation as an educational experience for children. That is, children should be exposed to the process of meal planning and cooking as opposed to mere presentation of food from the bowels of a building or the back of a truck. Further, the food should be

representative of the ethnic group or groups served rather than merely what government surplus has in the silos and warehouses that particular month. Meal time is traditionally not only for ingestion, but for socialization and education. We would hope that each program will consider, then, the non-nutritive aspects of food as well as the nutritive.

b) Health Care

1. Is medical, dental, and psychiatric care adequate?
2. Does day care create unique health care problems?
3. Is there an adequate referral system for health care?

We felt that determination of the way health care services are provided must be made at the local level. Some groups will wish to have a health care component included in the parents' fee for day care services, others will see day care facilities as taking the responsibility for health care while leaving payment up to the private individual, while yet others will see health care as strictly a parental function. Our concern is not which of the three modalities is used, but that health care is available when needed, and when needed, that it is adequate. The poor in this country are typically faced with two medical problems: 1) the location and availability of the health service, and 2) the quality of those services once located. An adequate medical complex may exist right around the corner from a day care facility, but unless the parent or day care director realizes it is available, and understands the mechanisms to be gone through for its use, the complex might as well be 300 miles away. It should also be obvious from the above questions that we are concerned with the broad range of medical and para-medical services. Dental and psychiatric services are therefore as important in their availability as is the more traditional general practice type of service. We strongly suggest that preventive health care be stressed. Mounting research indicates that good nutrition, mental and dental health in the early years, go a long way in creating a stable, productive adult. One would assume then, that from a cost benefit standpoint, money spent in the early years is indeed money well spent.

c) Cognitive, Social, and Emotional

One point of unanimous agreement at the Conference was that we were aware of the danger of magical promises that programs would raise intelligence, create discipline, and in general create a generation of renaissance men through some form of program for children. Research has made clear that no single process works well for all people, and as the process becomes further removed from its originator, its impact becomes steadily weakened, probably because people are then forced to copy and imitate rather than be involved in a

creative surge of their own. We were, therefore, concerned that relevant questions be asked, questions that were not solely geared to the present very limited set of existing early childhood tests. We want programs to create or demand evaluation techniques, not tests to create programs. We therefore suggest that each local day care service consider the following areas, and suggest that any single program cannot focus on all, but must make some central decisions about what they want for their children.

Is the child provided with the opportunity to enhance his ability to:

a) communicate in oral, non-verbal, and graphic forms;
b) obtain individual interaction with an adult without distraction from other adults and children;
c) develop musical and aesthetic expressions;
d) develop political (i.e. neighborhood) and social leadership and coping skills;
e) develop social responsibility;
f) maximize his physical motor skills (both fine and gross);
g) experiment with a variety of styles of analysis and synthesis;
h) organize and manage information;
i) adapt to new situations;
j) function in privacy and also have the opportunity to break rules, make his own decisions and cope with the consequences if discovered; and
k) grow in his environment through the use of a rich variety of natural and man-made materials?

In addition to the above we suggest

l) that there be made adequate program provisions for individual differences in functioning;
m) that adequate recognition of the variety of cultural, ethnic, and linguistic concerns of the consumer (parent, child, and community) be provided; and
n) that the cognitive, social, and personality aspects of the day care program be carefully related to the particular developmental level of the child.

Each of these points is purposely broad, as their exact definition will arise from the needs and desires of parents and children in each of the day care units. It is our hope that the topic areas will serve as catalysts for development, and that programs will not be governed by the reality limitations of evaluation, but rather by the reality needs of the consumer.

II Parents

We see parents asking the following questions which will require evaluation:

a) Does the day care program strengthen, support, or complement--and not harm--aspects of the family role?
b) Is communication between staff and parent adequate?
c) Part 1. Is the parent informed of his right to participate in the day care process and encouraged to exercise it?
Part 2. Given Part 1, is the parent then actively involved in the program up to the level of his concern?
d) Are the parent and program operator aware of community resources and activities?
e) Does the day care facility actively support parent groups?
f) Do parents have the opportunity to observe the program at times realistic for them?
g) Are parents given access to materials, methods, and training in child care procedures if they so wish?
h) Does what parents do at home support what happens in the day care program?
i) What attempts does the day care unit make to involve the father?
j) Can the parent place all her children in one center?

Much background for the above questions is given in Appendix B. Several points, however, bear further elaboration. Question a) again emphasizes our concern that day care services not promise the moon to parents or children. When day care can provide the same type of child rearing as that found in the "good home" it will be doing a good job. To promise cures for familial or social ills is unwise and to us irresponsible; better that day care be praised for what it has done well rather than damned for what it has enthusiastically promised and failed to deliver. A theme throughout these questions, and throughout the Conference was that day care provide an extension for, or of, "parenting" not a substitute. It therefore becomes critical that parents be involved in every stage of the way, in decisions, methods, goals and outcomes. Only in this way can parent and staff treat each other with mutual respect and develop that sense of harmony of goals, attitudes, and interests that are characteristic of a good child rearing situation. "Good" child rearing will be a cooperative effort between parent and day care unit, not a competitive one.

III Staff

We anticipate the following questions will be asked by day care staff and will require evaluation:

a) Is there an adequately trained supervisor for the day care unit?
b) Is there pre-service training for staff?
c) Is there an in-service training program for staff, mothers, and other interested or involved individuals?
d) Does in-service training include the variety of day care programs available to the consumer as well as use the case history

approach as a compl ment to the everyday concerns of the unit?

e) Does the staff show job stability; if not...
f) Is there continuity in child care?
g) Is there adequate staff release time and staff rotation?
h) Is there a real career development ladder for staff?
i) Is there an adequate male child care staff?
j) Does the staff reasonably represent the ethnic/cultural/ linguistic characteristics of the children in the day care unit?
k) Is input in decisions encouraged from all levels including staff?
l) Are adequate provisions made for formulative evaluation by staff, parents, and children? Does it have impact?
m) Does the staff have training in the social and ethical issues of day care operation?
n) Does the staff have an opportunity to view, and exchange information with, other day care units?
o) Is there an integration of staff-community relations?
p) Is the staff trained to provide care for illness?
q) Has the staff been trained to handle mixed age groups?
r) To what extent does staff effort create a ripple effect on other children in the family not enrolled in the day care unit?
s) How does this particular day care program relate to other methods of improving family and child development; i.e., half-day child development programs, income maintenance programs, employment programs for fathers, housing programs, family planning, working with parents at home, etc.?

Again, much of the background for these questions will be found in Appendix A. Our basic concerns are, however, that the staff be incorporated into the mainstream of the day care process, that as much information as is available about day care be presented to them in a manner which they can usefully process, and that they too see themselves as an extension of the family rather than competitors for the child's affection. As an extension of the family, they must be aware, as is the family, of their relationship to other aspects of community services for families and children. The ideal situation would be to see day care as part of a comprehensive plan of services for families--a cohesive, integrated, complementary part of those services. They should therefore have open communication and coordination with other agencies so each is augmenting the other, rather than working at cross purposes.

IV The Community

a) How has FAP day care affected economic and social conditions in the community?
b) How has support been offered, and are volunteers from various backgrounds involved in services for children and parents?

c) Has the FAP day care program had impact on other child-oriented services and organizations in the community? If so, how?

Here we suggest that the community should be aware of this potent force in its midst and attempt to integrate it, not only into the larger community, but coordinate its efforts with other available community services for families. Certainly, if FAP's main interest, the movement of the poor as productive members into the mainstream of society, is to be realized, community support and coordination for the day care component are critical. As a joint effort, community, family, and day care unit can provide the necessary support for the maximization of human potential.

The members of the Conference realize that this report is not exhaustive. We did feel, however, that the suggestions and recommendations offered in this chapter, in coordination with the rest of this report, would provide a working baseline for all groups interested in day care, and ultimately in the future of the children of the United States.

III. A FIVE YEAR EVALUATION WORK PLAN

Palmer, Glick and Cazden in their discussion of day care evaluation note the distinction made by Scriven (1963) between summative and formative evaluation. Summative evaluation is public, performed as a response to requests from people outside of the operational program. It is usually cross-regional, post-hoc, and descriptive, taking the approach of either witness for the defense or witness for the prosecution in the trial of a program. Ithas sometimes turned out badly, and is threatening to local programs. Outsiders can be unbiased, well-trained, and still not understand the programs as well as the people in them: a summative evaluation across all centers that also improves Day Care Center 3 in town #1 has not yet been designed.

Formative evaluation is private, performed by people in the program. Local programs evaluate their own success in reaching objectives they specify for themselves; formative evaluations change what they measure as data are fedback and are intended to improve a given program. Formative evaluations are more likely to increase the benefits to the children; communities may make mistakes in self-evaluation but these can become learning experiences in themselves that remain with the community as those involved assess the meaning of the findings. Since objectives and measures are not uniform, formative evaluations cannot be used to compare programs or provide a national state-of-the project report.

A third kind of evaluation might be called developmental. The concerns are public and the studies are national in scope. They, however, are on-going rather than one-time, and are associated with provision of technical assistance to programs found to be in difficulty. The goal of developmental evaluation, like formative evaluation, is improving program quality; the consequence of developmental evaluation, like that of summative evaluation, is to provide an overall picture of the program in terms of national objectives.

Review of FAP day care legislation, and fall 1970 plans indicate that:

- The system would have a formative period in which planning, start-up, and staff training would be significant activities. The period might be expected to last as long as two or three years before prime grantee organizations in all states were operating reasonably smoothly.

- During this period, evaluations should monitor management and program operation with frequent, periodic scans, feeding back information so that problems could be identified and resolved.

- At the same time, evaluation should stimulate a focus on benefiting the children and their families, upgrading program quality.

- Assuming that stable program operation which was not harming the children would be established, the focus might shift to training in specific techniques and to large-scale educational intervention designed to accelerate the children's development. At this time, national summative evaluations could be undertaken directed to the expectation of benefits, relative to mother-care.

- Inference for developmental or summative evaluations would require reliable and extensive baseline data, or the availability of non-FAP control communities. Either would involve immediate action in legislation and in support of baseline data collection studies.

- Availability of facilities and accuracy of employment forecasting were seen as principal concerns during the first two years. Anticipation of both problems would require interagency coordination with HUD and the Department of Labor in planning and evaluation.

Considering the first three years, it was recommended that FAP day care evaluation not take a posture which would set up unrealistic expectations. Rather, given basically custodial care in an organizationally complex system, evaluation would set out to show that no damage was done to the child and the family in comparison with a control group.[1] The first phase of the evaluation would be to construct a reporting system to find out if children are being hurt. A checklist of simple measures against which children in all programs could be assessed would be developed. For example, in the area of

---

1. Dunham notes, "Since these children are from underpriviledged backgrounds, there will be some tendency to expect day care to be an improvement over home care and to design evaluation around this view. We need also to find out whether group care is <u>as good</u> for them as is home care. This seems to me to call for slightly different research strategy. For example, in our recent sophistication, we may aknowledge that group care is not likely to raise IQ appreciably and thus omit intelligence testing. The older literature about inadequate group care does indicate that it may <u>lower</u> IQ. A large-scale shift to group care in infancy and early childhood, particularly a shift supported by the government, should demonstrate that it is not damaging. This would necessitate including a variable like IQ. FAP seems designed to assist parents (and the economy) more than to assist children. Therefore, its total effectiveness could depend on benefiting the economy and not damaging children."

physical development measures could include:

1. Is there an increase in height and weight for the children?
2. Is there an increase in respiratory diseases among children and staff?
3. Is the rate and frequency of certain other diseases, such as tuberculosis or lead poisoning, increasing?
4. Is muscle tone normal?

In the areas of psycho-social development, indicators could include such items as.

1. Is vocabulary size increasing?
2. Was the age of weaning normal?
3. Was the age of toilet training normal?
4. How many hours a day does the child cry?

Four sets of indicators (physical, personal-social, cognitive and family) would be developed for each of the major cultural groups served by FAP--black, Spanish-speaking, and Anglo; the measures would be selected for reliability in varied observation conditions and would be easily used by a nurse, teacher, or paraprofessional after a training session.

Data would be reported periodically through an MIS system. Programs where children were not developing as expected would be identified, and technical assistance provided for program improvement. Provision of non-punitive technical assistance would be essential for this system to work: when it is in the program's best interests to report promptly and accurately, reliable data should be provided.

A parallel reporting system would be developed for the planning and administrative operation.[1] Here indicators might include:

---

1. Dunham comments, "Some variables which should be studied in a large-scale change in child rearing are not child variables. Variables such as staff turnover or absenteeism are important economic variables. High rates of turnover may reflect poor hiring practices, job dissatisfaction, etc. They certainly raise the cost of the operation. Perhaps even more important, these variables probably affect the quality of child care (e.g., leading to multiple-mothering at least and perhaps to inexperienced caretakers). Independent variables in this category might be the structure of the hierarchy, personalities of director and staff, relationship and relative importance of research and caregiving functions of the setting, attitude of staff toward parents, etc."

See also Appendix E, Report of a subgroup chaired by Dr. Joseph S. Wholey.

1. Time between local grant and availability of real space
2. Accuracy of estimation of time to fill funded slots.
3. Turnover of operator and grantee personnel.
4. Stability of child enrollment.
5. Number of alternatives available to the mother.
6. Improvements in ratings on periodic certification assessments.
7. Comparison of standard costs and costs for non-FAP day care.
8. Time between vendor submission of vouchers and vendor payment.
9. Allocation of vendor and local grantee time.

Bimonthly or quarterly reports would be reviewed by the prime grantee and the national FAP staff and technical assistance provided for management improvement. Again, provision of non-punitive assistance would be essential for the management assessment system to work.

Both the management and child/family assessments would be <u>developmental</u>: the criteria of operational effectiveness and "harm to the child" would be established nationally, and the data would be assessed nationally. Information would be rapidly fed back to the local programs with assistance directed to program improvement. After a certain period of time, however, programs which were consistently harming the children should be terminated.

This implies provision of more slots than are actually needed in day care. Parent choice as the ultimate monitor of program quality is a basic assumption in the FAP system; however, if there is no good alternative in the community, the mother's choice cannot function as a control on quality and prime grantees can be threatened by discontinuity to the child and the mother if a center is closed down. The cost of unfilled slots should be regarded as medical and dental services are regarded: an essential part of providing good care for children.

Much advance work is needed to ready a developmental evaluation. There are no child scales that are entirely appropriate for all of the major ethnic subgroups, and none even partially appropriate as family indicators. Review of the available materials, development of new instruments, if necessary, and field tests of the scales for children and for management will probably require at least a year. The Management Information System would be the technical key to the developmental evaluation system; it should include information needed for program accountability at local, state, regional and national levels (e.g., costs, children enrolled), information for the managerial and child assessment system, and coordinate with other reporting systems so that the burden on local program operators could be reduced to a single reporting form. The system will have to process records of individual children, local grantees and state agencies; the volume of data will be so great that automatic data processing devices

(e.g., optical scanners) and data reduction systems (e.g., identifying only "in trouble" programs for bimonthly reports but providing charts of overall program effectiveness for yearly national reports) should be programmed as part of the initial system. System operation also has legislative implications: for example, grants should be made at the same time period (perhaps at three month intervals) rather than at staggered intervals so that the same reporting period can be used. A field test of this kind of system on at least a state scale should be provided as soon as possible; one of the major questions will be the feasibility of an approach reporting on every child in contrast to random, periodic samples.

During the first three years, formative evaluation grants should be made to all local grantees who apply for them. Technical assistance should be clearly in service of the objectives identified by local program operators and local parents so the children are not exploited as research subjects. Large formative evaluations are being tried out in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped experimental preschools; several other projects exploring training for formative evaluations are underway. The formative evaluations applications would be reviewed at the state level, and the state prime grantee would also be responsible for reviewing the biannual or annual formative evaluation reports, summarizing the findings, and assessing extension of the formative evaluation grant. Comparison of the developmental evaluation quality indicators for programs with and without formative evaluation would tell us whether formative evaluations have served to improve local program quality as anticipated. The findings from formative evaluations can also provide additional information on program effectiveness for national reports. A maximum of about $5,000 should be used as a ceiling on formative evaluation grants; this would provide support for local data collection and analysis in addition to that available through the developmental system, and should also encourage use of unobtrusive measures.

During the first three years, several FAP day care demonstrations and planned variation programs should be funded. Assessment of these programs should be comprehensive, so the programs provide information to Congress on results attainable with either different administrative structures or different programs, since it seems likely that major increases would require documented benefits that should not be expected with custodial day care.

Abert writes: "Specifically, I think we must ensure variation in: 1) the management, comparing the effectiveness of private and public day care center ownership; 2) the profit allowances to the proprietors; 3) the scale of the operation--with an eye toward discovering whether the mothers appreciate having a choice of centers and whether there are significant economies of scale; 4) the degrees of capital and

labor intensity in the centers; and 5) the funding arrangements, with a possible variant being that of simply giving the mothers sufficient money (or vouchers) and letting them make their own arrangements.'

The demonstration centers could serve as regional training sites, and, if associated with universities, as centers for research on day care and FAP. The centers should be funded for at least three years; phasing out would be expected as FAP day care nationally became more child development oriented.

Considering the fourth and fifth years of the evaluation plan, it was estimated that by the end of year three, FAP would either have been shown to have substantial problems requiring radical reorganization or operations would have been stabilized. In the latter case, (a) the formative and developmental components, including technical assistance and extensive monitoring, could be reduced to sampling or biannual levels, and (b) additional funds would be provided as needed to transform the programs from custodial to developmental care. The question appropriate for this phase would be "Is FAP day care benefitting the children relative to mother-care or to non-FAP day care children?" The summative evaluation studies would include middle class comparisons, assessment of cognitive, pre-academic and academic skills, and longitudinal studies of the children and their families as the children entered primary schools.

Day care programs could, of course, enter this stage earlier by seeking support from private and government agencies as research programs, if the parents and community representatives approve. Anticipation of benefits from FAP day care should follow provision of good child development programs, however, and the evaluation designs and measures appropriate for assessment of benefits would not be undertaken until the site visits by child development experts offered some assurance that funding, training, and technical assistance were adequate.

Among the concerns of the participants were:

- The need for measures sensitive to the competence of children in ethnic subgroups.

- Studies of the effect of FAP and FAP day care on the family stability, intra-family relationships, and the effectiveness of the family as a child rearing agent.

- Long term studies of the effects of FAP day care as a child rearing institution, with attention to possible additional stresses if maternal employment were unstable or if program quality varied substantially. The potential dangers of poor day care, particularly

poor day care associated with maternal stress, may not be fully apparent until the child has reached preadolescence when family direction bears a heavier burden.

- Anticipation of the long start-up periods that may be due to the unavailability of housing for group day care. Current legislation provides renovation but only limited construction. Licensing standards are often difficult to meet and the costs of FAP day care may be high due to delays in opening the doors.

- Assessment of the cost-effectiveness of training provided through the state prime grantee.

- Planning accuracy during Phase I for the prime grantees: the accuracy of Department of Labor job market estimates, accuracy of resource estimation, and coordination of state organizations.

- The validity of assumptions of incentive/control mechanisms built into FAP. For example, even where alternate care is provided for about the same cost and same transportation, will parental choice act as a fine control mechanism or will it act as a very imprecise control mechanism since mothers may be reluctant to disrupt the child's relationship with peers and a caretaker unless the situation is intolerable?

- Effectiveness of FAP for different mothers: is FAP more effective for mothers with only one child or more effective for older mothers who may have greater job stability despite problems of coordinating child care for several children of different ages?

- After the program stabilizes, FAP day care as a system of child care services should be assessed: how does FAP compare, for example, as a delivery system for medical services in relation to the Community Health Centers or the Maternal and Child Health Centers? Is family alienation reduced, and personal competence enhanced by FAP in relation to the welfare system it replaced or by alternative systems that may be concurrently investigated? What are the implications of focusing on employment and job training for mothers in contrast to focus on job training for fathers? What is the impact of FAP on other community institutions serving the poor? On the attitudes toward the poor of lower middle-class families who may not receive FAP, wish to work and cannot find child care?

Some of these questions could be answered through the developmental evaluation system; some through demonstration centers. Others would require additional evaluations that should be considered by the end of the second program year.

Steps toward the five year evaluation plan:

The following twelve steps would prepare for initiating the evaluation and FAP at the same time.[1] All would require a state-wide trial of FAP and coordination with on-going day care projects.

1. Identification of indicators of damage
2. Identification of measures of development and needs
3. Identification of external system
4. Field test of formative system
5. Field test of report system
6. Field test of status report
7. Field test of administrative process evaluation and report system
8. Design auspice variability study
9. Finance normative studies of indicators
10. Devise longitudinal study system
11. Devise measures of program acceptance
12. Devise system for study of community, family and institutional effects.

Estimated costs of the FAP day care evaluation system - Years 1 - 2:

Formative evaluation: 400 communities, $5,000 each	$2,000,000
MIS developmental system: data collection and analysis, per year, 400,000 children	2,000,000
Ten regional planned variation research and demonstration centers	2,000,000
MIS developmental system: technical assistance	1,000,000
Additional evaluation studies	500,000
	$7,500,000/yr.

Estimated costs of the FAP day care evaluation systems - Years 3 - 5:

Formative evaluation: 400 communities	---------
MIS monitoring system: data collection and analysis	$1,000,000
MIS monitoring system: technical assistance	500,000
Ten regional training centers	1,000,000
National Impact studies	500,000
Longitudinal studies	500,000
Systems evaluation studies	500,000
	$4,000,000/yr.

1. These steps were outlined by Dr. Irving Lazar.

In summary, the evaluation plan recommended by the participants is not cheap; it represents a new approach, one that will require extensive development and field-testing before it is ready. Evaluations all too often have been tacked onto programs; despite their high costs, relatively little of value to the programs has emerged. Too much is at stake in FAP day care to perpetuate trial-by-inadequate evaluation. Although it is late already with FAP legislation in Congressional review, there is still time for our accountability to begin by advance planning and funding of an evaluation approach for FAP day care.

The questions anticipated for different audiences and the evaluation strategy recommended were not, it must be stressed, developed for day care research in general. They reflect responses to the legislative and organizational characteristics of November 1970 FAP day care and an assessment of what Congress, parents and educators must know about how the FAP system works and how it affects the lives of children and their families that should be considered in decision-making after the first few years of operation. The participants were unanimous in recommending that monitoring the system be given highest priority during the first years, and have developed an evaluation approach that may serve equally local program quality and a larger accountability.

Listed below are studies of day care already underway:

About $15,000,000 has already been invested in day care research and evaluation studies. Some of this money has supported handbooks and manuals that will be needed by day care center operators. Other studies include investigations of what works best in day care as it is now practiced, surveys assessing needs and facilities, and prototype systems or provision of methods, e.g., for cost/benefit analysis. At present, there is little coordination among these efforts; a prototype evaluation system is not yet in the field with a prototype FAP day care project. A first step in moving toward a field-ready evaluation strategy would be to see what in the work already underway could be adapted or modified for the needs of the FAP day care evaluation system outlined here. A second step would be to form an interagency coordination panel for day care research, demonstration and evaluation studies to that interagency funding of the studies not currently available but needed could proceed as rapidly as possible. A third step would be to provide an interagency clearing house for reports from already funded studies, new and old, and data from other major day care programs such as those funded by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Donner Foundation. (See Appendix F)

IV. HIGHLIGHTS OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

Delegating child rearing from the mother to the community in the belief that the larger social needs of the family will be best served in this way is a new concept for this country. There are no ready parallels in current research in America or in the experience of other countries. The Fall 1970 draft legislation appears to (a) provide protective care, and (b) involve complex systems for assessing eligibility, for predicting job openings and day care slot availability, for training, monitoring, and coordinating national, regional, state and local organizations across three major government agencies. The evaluation efforts should help make this effort work, and also reflect a certain conservatism of expectations in accountability.

Conservative, or liberal, the evaluation is accountable to several audiences: to Congress and Federal decision makers, to administration and granting agencies at the national, regional and state levels, to parents, to child development experts, to local program operators, and to the country at large. The task of the workshop was to anticipate the questions these audiences will ask, identifying the technology needed to answer such questions and recommending funding priorities and evaluation[1] activities for initial, early and later periods of FAP day care.

1. ASSUMING THAT FAP DAY CARE IS LIKELY TO BE PRIMARILY PROTECTIVE, developmental evaluation should (a) provide a rapid assessment of whether participation does any harm to the child and his family, and (b) be linked to a technical assistance system that could help local program operators remedy deficiencies as rapidly as possible. The first question[2] for evaluation of the legislation described in Fall 1970 is, therefore, "Compared with child care by the mother, is FAP day care hurting children and their families?" To answer this question we will need to develop indicators of acceptable child development, of family well-being and of desirable child rearing

---

1. The workshop was not asked to offer recommendations about FAP day care per se, or about research, as contrasted to evaluation. These concerns could not be arbitrarily severed from discussion of evaluation, and recommendations for all three are as appear in Section II and in the conference notes in Appendix B.

2. All participants strongly urged that funds be provided for developmental, not merely custodial care.

patterns for the groups to be served by FAP day care. We will need to find a reliable inexpensive way to assess periodically the status of each child and his family, to identify problem sites, and to provide the technical assistance for grantees and program operators.

Accountability at the end of one or two years thus becomes documentation of the development of children and the status of families relative to child care by non-working, FAP-eligible mothers. Good child care has been shown previously not to harm the children (Keister, 1970); replicating this level of effectiveness will be a reasonable accomplishment for a new program operating in a complex administrative system with funds and staff sufficient primarily for protective care.

2. ASSUMING THAT THE FAP DAY CARE DELIVERY SYSTEM ITSELF IS BEING TRIED OUT DURING THE FIRST TWO OR THREE YEARS, evaluation should provide parallel information on indicators of organizational effectiveness that can assess administrative progress (e.g., obtaining facilities; establishing a stable, well-trained staff; providing minimal organizational restraints so staff time is child-directed). These indicators similarly must be reliable, inexpensive to collect, and be part of an assessment system that can identify projects in trouble, can offer administrative technical assistance and can eventually report to Congress on organizational and funding efficiency.

3. ASSUMING THAT THE GREATEST IMPACT ON PROGRAM QUALITY WILL COME FROM LOCALLY MEANINGFUL EVALUATIONS, formative (community originated) evaluations will be supported from the planning phase onward. The main purpose of the local evaluation is improvement of program quality by sharpening local objectives for the children and their families, and by identifying what best reaches these objectives. Self-initiated reviews of self-identified goals repeatedly have been shown to lead to greater change than assessments imposed from the outside. Formative evaluation applies the principle to continue local program quality. Local evaluations can also show more sensitively and richly than national studies the ways in which the child and his family may benefit from FAP participation.

4. ASSUMING THAT DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS ARE PROVIDING A PLANNED VARIATION APPROACH ARE NEEDED TO TEST THE EFFECTS OF MAJOR SYSTEM/PROGRAM DIMENSIONS, ten regional centers should be funded during the first three years. These would be phased into centers for personnel training when both the R&D data and FAP operation indicated the advisability of large-scale dissemination of the newer approaches.

5. ASSUMING THAT ENHANCING CHILD AND FAMILY DEVELOPMENT CAN BE A LONG-RANGE OBJECTIVE OF FAP DAY CARE, AND THAT ADDITIONAL FUNDS WILL EVENTUALLY BE AVAILABLE, the three to five year summative evaluations would assess the extent to which participation benefitted children and their families in comparison to (a) the development of children without FAP day care and (b) the development of children of more economically advantaged families. The expectation that FAP day care is helping children would follow, not precede, the funding levels, organizational stability, and staff qualifications that previous work has indicated may be essential before acceleration of child development can be expected.

In summary, the first one-to-three years of FAP evaluation would ask, "Is participation harming the children?" The second three-to-five year period of FAP would ask, "Is the program benefitting children and their families?" The first question is expected to be asked by Congress and program administrators; the second question is anticipated as one of greatest concern for parents, the country at large, and child development specialists. It is estimated that the evaluation costs (including 10 regional demonstration centers) of years 1-3 would be about $7.5M annually; years 3-5 would probably cost $4.0M annually.

Many aspects of this evaluation system are wholly new; the assumptions are untried--for example, that if the quality of technical assistance provided to programs in trouble is high enough, it would be in these programs' best interests to report promptly and accurately. A one-year field trial of the first three parts of the system is recommended. The steps necessary to prepare for the evaluation are:

1.	Formative evaluation trial	6 mos.	$100,000
2.	Organizational developmental evaluation		
	a. indicators/MIS system	3 mos.	150,000
	b. field trial	9 mos.	100,000
3.	Child/family developmental evaluation		
	a. indicators/report system	3 mos.	150,000
	b. field trial	9 mos.	200,000

These estimates are based on the belief that some components of the evaluation system are already under study and that field trials of the FAP day care system itself are being planned so the evaluation field trials could be coordinated with the systems trials. Previous experience with evaluation systems imposed after program operators have been funded indicate that the evaluation should be prepared in advance so that a commitment to the evaluation reporting requirements

are established as part of the initial grant. This evaluation approach is an overall strategy; it is expected that the system will need fine-tuning after the field trial to be ready by January 1972.

PROPOSED CHILD CARE PROGRAM UNDER

THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT

The Department proposes to provide child care services for eligible children in the Family Assistance Program by making Project Grants to Prime Grantee agencies established at the State level, and at the local level (in urban centers of 100,000 population or greater) which are designated by the appropriate public official. The Prime Grantee would be responsible for (1) working in conjunction with the Employment Service and agency administering the Family Assistance Program to determine in advance the need for child care services, (2) to develop a plan for utilization of existing resources in the community and to stimulate the development of new resources when needed, (3) to solicit, evaluate, and select among proposals submitted by public, private non-profit and private for-profit groups in the community wishing to develop child care programs, (4) to assist parents in making child care arrangements and in resolving problems which may occur in relation to child care, (5) to collect fees from those parents who are able to share the cost of care, (6) to operate a vendor payments system program whereby care is purchased for children in the existing programs in the community, and (7) to monitor and evaluate the services provided by the various child caring groups. The Prime Grantee would not operate a direct service program except in unusual situations.

Any public or private non-profit agency could be designated as a Prime Grantee provided that the agency (or its proposed Family Assistance Program child care activities) was subject to a policy setting body composed of representatives of the public and private agencies and organizations in the community with an interest in day care and child development, and with at least one-third of the membership composed of parents of children eligible for day care services under the Family Assistance Program.

Direct grants (or contract with profit making agencies) would be made when no Prime Grantee agency has been designated, or when it is considered advisable to do so in order to accomplish the goals of the family assistance program.

Grants on contracts will be awarded to train persons as (1) Community Planners, able to organize existing resources and develop new resources in a community in an orderly manner to meet the needs for child care under the program, and to utilize existing resources when possible to reduce cost under the Family Assistance Program, and (2) Day Care Program staff, both professional and non-professional.

Contracts would be arranged with State agencies presently responsible for licensing day care programs to study, evaluate and certify all day care programs in the State which meet Federal program quality standards.

Under the Family Assistance Act, child care services may be provided for the following families:

(a) Those which have registered for employment or training under the provisions of Part D of Title IV as added by the Family Assistance Act.

(b) Those which are receiving supplementary financial payments from a state pursuant to Part E of Title IV as added by the Family Assistance Act.

(c) Those which had formerly received benefits under Part D or Part E.

(d) Those with an adult family member referred pursuant to Section 447(d) of the Act to participate in vocational rehabilitation.

(e) Those which are receiving AFDC payments prior to the date when Part D becomes effective for a state

In each case, the family is eligible only if the purpose for providing child care is to better enable an adult family member, who would otherwise be providing care for the children, to engage in training, to take employment, to continue employment or to participate in vocational rehabilitation. Continued child care would be permitted for short periods of time if the parent is ill; seasonally unemployed; temporarily layed off; or unemployed but actively looking for work.

In concert with the Family Assistance Act, the Manpower Training Act of 1969, provides for a wide-range of manpower services, training and employment programs. Child care services may be provided through the Manpower Training Act to support the participation of adults in these programs. In most cases, a parent who is seperated and the head of the household will be eligible for training, employment services and child care services under The Family Assistance Act. However, there will be situations when such a parent will not be receiving Family Assistance benefits, but will wish to participate in the training and employment programs available under the Manpower Training Act. In this event, it would be possible for the manpower agency to contract with the Prime Grantee agency to provide child care services as part of the overall community plan.

As indicated above, the Prime Grantee would be responsible for working closely with the Employment Service or Manpower Agency to determine in advance the need for child care services under the Family Assistance Program. This activity could easily be expanded to determine the need for child care services in the CEP, JOBS and other programs. The subsequent plan for providing child care services could include meeting these needs, and the Prime Grantee agency could provide the appropriate services.

Estimate of Children to be Served During First Year

It is estimated that 150,000 pre-school age and 300,000 school age children will receive child care services under the Family Assistance Act during the first year of operation.

This estimate was arrived at by the White House working group for the Family Assistance Act. It is based on the Department of Labor's plan for 150,000 training slots and AFDC family size data which indicates that there is an average of 3.2 children in each AFDC family, one (1) pre-school age child and two (2) school-age children.

The figures represent, of course, only an initial gross estimate of the children to be served. The Department is presently working with the Department of Labor to refine these estimates in light of more definitive planning in regard to the training program, further study of the AFDC program family compositions and expected registration of AFDC families with pre-school age children, and estimates of the need for child care among the working poor families.

Day Care Arrangements

Parents may select, from among a wide variety of existing child care arrangements, a plan which best suits the needs of their children and the practical convenience of the family. The Department will encourage and stimulate expansion of present resources and development of new models in order to assure that children receive safe, stable care and that, knowing this, the parents can turn their attention to succeeding in their training and employment program. A description of the types of child care which will be provided follows:

A. In-Home Care

Care of a child in his own home by someone other than the parent. The caretaker may be a relative, a friend, or a neighbor selected by the parent, or may be an individual--trained and working under the supervision of an agency--who goes into the child's home to give care. Parents usually pay between $15 and $50 per week for this type of care, depending upon the number of children and the private relationship between the parent and the caretaker.

B. Family Day Care Homes

Care in a private home, which is licensed by a State or local public agency to provide care. Many women seek this method of earning income while remaining home with their own children. Family day care homes are also often organized under the sponsorship of a private or public

agency to provide care for children referred to the agency. Payment for the care is made by the agency which, in turn, collects a fee from the parent (often supplemented by the welfare department or United Fund agency). Family day care homes must be licensed to operate in most States; some local communities also require licensing. State licensing laws usually limit the number of children who may receive care at any one time in a private home to six (6). The cost of family day care approximates that in Group Day Care Homes and Day Care Centers, ranging between $1100/pre-school child/year for custodial care to $1600/pre-school child/year for developmental care which includes services to stimulate and assist the physical, social, emotional and intellectual growth of the child.

C. Group Day Care Homes

Care in a private home which has been converted in part to a small day care center, but which is also used as a private dwelling. These facilities are subject to State licensing in most States, and are usually limited to twelve (12) children. The caretaker employs additional help to assist her in providing care. Agencies may sponsor Group Day Care Homes. Cost: $1100/pre-school child/year for custodial care; $1600/pre-school child/year for developmental care.

D. Day Care Centers

Care in a specially designed facility equipped and staffed to serve a large number of children, usually about sixty (60). Such centers may be operated by a public or private agency or as a private for-profit business enterprise. They are found in communities under a variety of names, i.e., day care center, day nursery, nursery school, day school. Day Care Centers are subject to State and local licensing requirements. Cost: $1100/pre-school child/year for custodial care; $1600/pre-school child/year for developmental care.

E. Combinations of Home and Group Care

Combinations of the above types of care may be arranged when possible, e.g., a child receiving care in a home situation would participate in the early morning educational activities of a day care center, and then return to

the day care home. When such arrangements are made, the cost is determined on the basis of the amount of time the child spends in each facility.

Non-professionals will be employed extensively in the child care programs as caretakers of children in family day care homes, or in the child's own home; aides in group day care homes; teacher aides and assistant teachers; social service aides; bus drivers; cooks and nutrition aides; health service aides; office workers; maintenance workers, and as recreation leaders in the school-age programs. It is estimated that initially 12 percent of all positions in the child care program will be filled by non-professionals who have been recipients of AFDC assistance or in the "working poor" group. Training programs will permit these employees to move up the career ladder so that they would eventually fill 65 percent of all positions in the child care program.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE CHILD CARE PROVISIONS OF THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

1. Question: What are child care services?

Answer: Child care services include the funding of care for the child in his own home, in a family day care program, or in a group day care program. It includes care both for preschool children and for school-age children during the summer, on school holidays and before and after regular school hours. HEW would propose to limit such care to children under the age of 15 except in special circumstances when an older child requires protective care (i.e. mentally retarded children, or handicapped children). There would be no minimum age limit. The length of program for a child will depend on the needs of the parent -- it may be only a few hours a day or as long as 10 to 12 hours a day -- it may be provided during night time hours as well as during the day. Child care services aim to provide activities that contribute toward the intellectual, physical, social and emotional growth and development of the child.

2. Question: Who is eligible to receive child care services?

Answer: Child care services may be provided for the following families:

a) those which have registered for employment or training under the provisions of Part D of Title IV as added by the Family Assistance Act.

b) those which are receiving supplementary financial payments from a

state pursuant to Part E of Title IV as added by the Family Assistance Act.

c) those which had formerly received benefits under Part D or Part E.

d) those with an adult family member referred pursuant to Sec. 447 (d) of the Act to participate in vocational rehabilitation.

e) those which are receiving AFDC payments prior to the date when Part D becomes effective for a state.

In each case, the family is eligible only if the purpose for providing child care is to better enable an adult family member to engage in training, to take employment, to continue employment or to participate in vocational rehabilitation. HEW would intend to permit continued child care for short periods of time if the parent is ill, seasonally unemployed, temporarily layed off, or unemployed but actively looking for work. The Secretary is authorized to limit the length of time which an individual may continue to receive child care after they are no longer eligible for benefits under Part D or Part E.

3. Question: Who may receive funds for child care?

Answer: Funds may be provided either in the form of direct grants or contracts to any state or local public agency or nonprofit private agency or organization, (only contracts may be arranged with a private for-profit agency which is designated by the appropriate elected or appointed official or officials in the area. A capacity to work effectively with the manpower agency is required. HEW would propose to establish criteria for use in determining the competence of organizations to carry out a child care program. Equal consideration would be given to all types of agencies

as operators of child care service programs. HEW would give preference as to prime grantees to those organizations which either were themselves or were a part of coordinated efforts to deliver day care and preschool services (for example, the Community Coordinated Child Care -- 4-C -- Program). This preference follows the philosophy of the statutory provisions found in Title V-B of the Economic Opportunity Act which mandates the Secretary and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to establish mechanisms for coordination at the local level. On the other hand, the absence of a coordinating mechanism would not be a bar to funding public or private agencies.

Grants could be made to employers, labor unions or combinations thereof. HEW would consider them as eligible grantees but would not give them preference over other public and private agencies.

Child care funds could be given directly to individuals. It would, however, be possible to give grants or contracts to an intermediary organization which would provide an intake and referral service to parents assisting them in selecting among the many existing child care services in a community. In such cases the intermediary organization would then provide child care through the issuance of a voucher to, or the making of payments on behalf of the parents, to the service provider.

4. Question: What may be funded as a part of child care services?

Answer: Funds may be provided to carry out a program of daily activities, to provide transportation, to provide food for use in the program, to provide necessary supplies and materials, and to provide for medical and dental examinations and for referral and follow through with

health care agencies. Treatment costs may be funded in the absence of other funds to provide for remedial health care and where it is determined that the absence of such care will adversely affect the ability of the child to participate in the program. Funds may be provided for all personnel costs necessary for operation of the program. Funds are also available for alterations to buildings, remodeling and for renovation. Funds are available for rent. Funds are NOT available for new construction.

HEW would plan to apply the standards developed under Title V-B of the Economic Opportunity Act (Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements) to the funding of programs under the Family Assistance Act. This is consistent with the requirements of Title V-B of the Economic Opportunity Act that standards be as uniform as possible among day care programs.

5. Question: What proportion of total cost will HEW pay?

Answer: The Federal Government will pay up to 100% of the total cost of child care programs.

6. Question: Are families required to pay a portion of the cost of day care?

Answer: The law authorizes the Secretary to require families to pay for part or all of the costs of services in such amounts as may be reasonable in light of the family's ability. HEW would propose that no fees be charged when the individual is in a training status or in his first three months of employment. A sliding scale of payments would be developed for those individuals who have entered into employment. This sliding scale would take into account the relationship between income and family size. It would permit recognition of special factors such as unusual medical

expenses which make it difficult for a family to pay for day care. The costs which the family pays itself are excluded from their income in calculating their eligibility for assistance under the Family Assistance Program.

7. Question: What role will the state government play in the administration of the program?

Answer: State agencies may be the grantee for child care funds in those situations where they are in the best position to provide for child care services. HEW will require that all child care programs meet the licensing requirements of the states. HEW will contract with state agencies to provide technical assistance to grantees to help the latter to meet licensing regulations. HEW would also propose to use state agencies under technical assistance contracts to assist grantees to improve their programs.

8. Question: Will funds be available for training and technical assistance?

Answer: There will be funds available for training and technical assistance. These funds may be provided in the form of grants to any public or private (including for-profit) agency or organization. HEW would propose to use training funds for all categories of personnel involved in the provision of child care services; for career development in the case of nonprofessionals, and for graduate level training in the case of those individuals who have supervisory or leadership potential. HEW will also propose to use these funds for the training of evaluation and research personnel.

9. Question: Are funds available for research or demonstrations?

Answer: Funds are available for research and demonstration projects to public and private (including for-profit) agencies or organizations. HEW would propose to coordinate research and demonstration funding under this authorization with research and demonstration funds available under the Head Start program, Section 426 of the Social Security Act and other Federal authorizations administered by the Department.

10. Question: When a family is required to pay a portion or all of the cost of child care, may such cost be deducted from earned income?

Answer: The Secretary may prescribe requlations which permit a family to deduct all or part of such costs from earned income. HEW would propose that the full cost of such care be deductible provided that the costs do not exceed those which the Federal Government would finance under the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements.

11. Question: How will grants be made?

Answer: Agencies designated as applicants for child care grants will file an application with the appropriate HEW Regional Office of Child Development. Where a community has established coordination mechanisms, priority will be given to those applications for operation of child care service programs which have the approval of the coordinating organization. Where no coordinating agency exists, grants will be made on the basis of the quality and cost of the program proposed by each applicant.

12. Question: What do the words "renovation"and "remodeling" mean?

Answer: The legislation gives no definition of these terms. HEW would propose to give them a very broad interpretation, but would exclude purchase of land or construction of a new building. Minor additions

to a building which did not involve an increase of more than 20% in the size of the building would be included in the definition of renovation and remodeling. Remodeling and renovation funds would be available for both family and group day care facilities.

13. Question: How much money is available for child care services?

Answer: The law authorizes appropriation of such funds as are necessary to carry out the purposes of the Act. It also requires that the Secretary shall make provision for the furnishing of child care services for so long as he deems appropriate to persons who, pursuant to registration under Section 447, are participating in manpower services, training or employment. Funds are expected to be available in sufficient amounts to ensure that child care services are available to eligible recipients.

14. Question: May the Secretary of Labor provide day care services?

Answer: The Secretary of Labor has authority to provide child care services in support of manpower and training programs under his jurisdiction. However, he must obtain the concurrence of HEW with regard to policies to be used in administering such child care programs. HEW would recommend that the Secretary of Labor provide child care service only in exceptional circumstances and that, in such cases, the Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements be fully applicable.

15. Question: What will happen to day care provided under the Work Incentive Program?

Answer: The Work Incentive Program will be repealed at the time the new Family Assistance Program becomes effective. During the interim

period, day care may be provided under the Family Assistance Act in lieu of day care provided under the WIN program. The time at which this transition will be made will depend upon the availability of appropriations.

16. Question: What will happen to day care funded under Parts A and B of Title IV of the Social Security Act?

Answer: States may continue to fund day care programs under Parts A and B of Title IV subject to the policies and regulations presently in effect. It will usually be financially advantageous, of course, to provide such care under the Family Assistance Act rather than Title IV. There are, however, individuals who may not be eligible for services under the Family Assistance Act but who would qualify under the provisions of Title IV. This would be particularly true in the case of potential recipients.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PROVISION OF CHILD CARE UNDER THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Social Security Office	Employment Service	Prime Grantee[1]	Day Care Contractor[2]
	A. Initial Arrangements for Child Care		
1. Individual applies for family assistance. Social Security notifies employment service.	2. Individual registers for training or employment. Employment service advises child care prime grantee of approximately when individual will enter employment or training.	3. Representative of prime grantee may be assigned as a member of employment service team. In any event will work closely with coach. Prime grantee advises individual of available options; (a) Income exclusion (b) In-home care (c) Family day care (d) Group day care (e) Vendor payment A. If individual selects income exclusion, prime grantee notifies Social Security. B. If individual selects in-home care or vendor payment, prime grantee arranges payments. C. If individual selects family or group care, prime grantee arranges child's enrollment	

4. Contractor provides day care examples of prime grantee would include a 4-C organization, a welfare department, an education agency, or a health and welfare council. Contractors may include any competent public, private nonprofit or private for-profit organization.

MAJOR RESPONSIBILITIES IN THE PROVISION OF CHILD CARE UNDER THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Social Security Office	Employment Service	Prime Grantee	Day Care Contractor
	B. OTHER RESPONSIBILITIES		
1. Notifies prime grantee when individual no longer qualifies for FAP.	1. Advises prime grantee if: Individual terminates training or employment. Individual alleges that child care arrangements are inadequate to permit her to maintain employment.	1. Works with employment service to develop jobs for FAP recipients in child care field. 2. Helps individuals to change child care arrangements if they are dissatisfied. 3. Monitors operation of child care programs to see that standards are met. 4. Collects fees from parents who can pay part of costs. 5. Assists individuals to obtain other child care when they are no longer eligible for care under family assistance program 6. Coordinate activities with other early childhood programs. Provides training and technical assistance.	

APPENDIX B

RESEARCH ACCOUNTABILITIES IN THE DAY CARE COMPONENT OF THE FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN: A WORKING PAPER

E. Robert LaCrosse, Jr.
President
Pacific Oaks College
714 West California Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91105

Office of Child Development Evaluation Conference

November 5, 1970
Washington, D.C.

INTRODUCTION AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper was written at the request of Dr. Lois-ellin Datta, Chief of the Evaluation Branch of the Department of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Child Development. The basic intent of the paper is to attempt to anticipate the types of questions that the various groups involved in the Family Assistance Plan (FAP) will ask of the FAP day care component. This arises from "the concern...that there be some kind of long-range planning in day care evaluation, particularly the kind of planning that considered out accountability to our several constituencies, and the kinds of questions we (OCD) are reasonably responsible for answering that each of these constituencies may raise."[1]

The following pages attempt to raise and discuss the possible range of questions that could be asked. The paper is intended as a working outline for a conference on family assistance day care evaluation, held at the Office of Child Development, Washington, D.C. on November 5 and 6, 1970. It is the purpose of that conference to consider the questions raised on these pages (as well as those the author has not anticipated), recommend available designs to answer each (or the fact that there is no applicable design currently available) and, finally, a priority listing of questions to be answered, given available research funds. The paper was written over a two-week period, sandwiched between college duties. It cannot pretend to be exhaustive, and only the author should be held responsible for its content. The author, however, would like to thank the faculty of Pacific Oaks College, particularly Elizabeth Prescott, Director of Research, whose systematic studies of day care in its infinite variety and face-to-face conversations have been of inestimable help in the construction of this paper.

---

[1] Datta, Lois-ellin, personal communication, October 14, 1970

OUTLINE OF QUESTIONS

Below are listed the questions to be considered by the conference, in the order in which they appear in the body of the working paper. Those which can be directly answered by research will have to be examined for timing, i.e., should they be answered after the first year of FAP, the third year, the fifth? Should they be continuous etc.? Some questions will require administrative/policy answers, but they are included for conference discussion since answers to policy questions will have impact on research decisions.

1. Congress

   a. Do the mothers using the FAP day care component become gainfully employed?

      1. What is meant by gainful employment?

   b. Is mothers at work with their children in day care a better situation than mothers at home caring for their own children?

   c. How does the FAP day care program fit into the larger social system?

   d. Does FAP reduce welfare rolls and decrease welfare problems?

      1. Is one job training program effective in moving people out of FAP?

      2. Are all eligible people being reached?

      3. Is FAP, as executed, the same across all states?

      4. Are all forms of day care provided equally used and relevant?

      5. Does the welfare birthrate go down?

2. Federal Level Program Administrators

   a. What are the goals of the day care program?

      1. Who controls the program and curriculum?

b. Who controls program planning?

c. How is FAP day care program eligibility to be determined?

d. What types of research should be done for the gathering of required information, and what types of research should generally be permitted?

e. What happens to the parental authority role when day care and job training are provided?

f. For whom is the program ineffective?

g. How is the unit of community for the day care component to be defined?

h. What happens to mothers who stay on welfare or continue under FAP without taking a job?

i. Are the prime grantees and their delegate agencies expending funds according to published guidelines and in a manner most beneficial to the populations served?

3. Prime Grantees and Their Delegate Agencies (Program Operators)

a. How stable is FAP day care funding?

1. Will we have to spend half of each year writing a funding proposal for the next?

2. Will money be awarded on a per capita basis, or as needed?

b. What will staff qualifications be?

c. Do I need to be licensed?

d. Who has responsibility for program quality, the administrator or someone else?

e. How efficient does the program have to be?

f. Who will be responsible for parent education?

g. Who has authority over day care space?

h. Who controls the allotment of services?

4. Researchers - Child Development Experts

a. Are the FAP day care services available to be researched, and if so, what are the limitations, if any?

1. What is the impact on the child of the particular type of day care environment he occupies?

2. Does a sense of effectance in the community change for the child or the parents?

3. Does the parents' feeling about confidence in their child's future increase?

4. What is the most effective way to keep communication flowing between mother and day care worker?

5. Does the mother/child relationship improve, remain the same, or worsen after a child is put in day care?

6. What types of children are most benefited by what type of day care? (similar to 1?)

7. What is a good infant curriculum beyond typical custodial care?

8. Is what is learned in day care by the child transferable to his own neighborhood?

9. Does the center and the home match in values and if they differ what is the impact on the parent/child relationship?

10. Does day care weaken or strengthen the maternal bond?

11. Does day care turn out children with any characteristic personality traits?

12. Do day care and non-day care children differ in later school performance?

13. What are disease patterns in day care situations?

14. Is the child's IQ raised, or are his readiness skills enhanced, or are his cognitive capabilities augmented?

5. Parents

a. Will day care equal or better the care my child will get

at home?

b. How will I know what is happening to him?

c. Am I being a "good mother" by letting someone else rear my child?

d. Will he learn anything?

e. How will what happens at the day care center relate or be relevant to what goes on at home or in the neighborhood?

f. Will he outgrow me?

g. Are these people qualified to take care of my child?

h. Is there other day care available so when I can't use FAP day care anymore I can still keep my job?

i. Who will take care of him when he is really sick?

There are five major groups who will be asking questions of the day care component of FAP:

1. Congress
2. Federal-level program administrators
3. Prime grantees at the state-level and their delegate agencies
4. Research and evaluation personnel
5. Parents

Each of the above groups will have a set of questions characteristic of its own world view. As anticipated by the author, these questions are presented below under each interest group category, and after each question there follows a brief discussion of their relevance and potential impact.[2]

1. Congress

a. Do the mothers using the FAP day care component become gainfully employed?

This is an obvious question since the entire FAP program is intended to take mothers' families off of welfare and place them into jobs which will enable them tc become "productive" members of society. The question, however, will have to be answered with care. There will be some whose main concern is getting people off the welfare rolls, with little interest in whether the day care component is effective. Others, however, will very likely take the stance that day care for poor people is a right and regardless of whether it helps mothers get jobs it should be kept because it is a right. It may be difficult to evaluate what role the day care component actually plays in helping people to find jobs. For instance, the mere offer of job training, possibly coupled with monitary incentives to enter job training (as appears to be the case with FAP) may be enough for a movement from welfare without the provision of day care services. Although there are well documented statements indicating that many people without jobs (at all SES levels) are interested in day care as a release to the job market, one cannot automatically conclude that if day care were offered it would be used. As a college president, the author has noted a peculiar phenomenon: a sudden need arises when people realize that they haven't got something that a) they see others have, or b) they feel they should have. Much time and energy is then spent at all levels creating the particular desired circumstances, then people relax, feel good knowing it is there for them to use, but go about their business as

[2] The author has attempted to anticipate questions which will be asked both publicly and privately. The questions do not necessarily reflect the author's own feelings about the FAP and the current welfare and day care situation.

usual while "it" sits there, quite alone. The point is, therefore, that data collected will have to indicate that people become effectively employed because day care services were offered, i.e., day care must be isolated as an important and effective variable leading to adult productivity. This implies the use of control groups and one must face the issue of whether it is morally correct to deprive some of day care services, while letting others have access to it. Day care may prove quite a bit more expensive than job training; therefore, it will probably come under fire as an expensive frill. Data relating its impact on human effectiveness is critical.

"Gainfully employed" is also a phrase which will need careful definition. In most people's minds the phrase represents a 9 - 5 job paying enough money for family support. Human needs and human variability mitigate against the idea of people moving from welfare to the typical 9 - 5 job. Some mothers may wish to take on part-time jobs to enable them to get out of the house and earn some household money. They may wish, however, not to become self-supporting because they wish to spend some time with their children; the job situation will suit them nicely, but may not be considered as gainful employment because it is not self-supporting. Clear definition of terms in reference to "gainful employment" of "self-supporting" will have to be carefully done before statistics can be gathered.

b. Is mothers at work with their children in day care a better situation than mothers at home caring for their own children?

This will likely be an emotional issue as there are strong pressures in this country for a mother with children to stay at home and do her own childrearing. Emotional issues aside, one must still ask the question of what will happen to a generation of poor children raised in other than a home situation. There is no correlation between unemployment and "bad mothering," although it is a link many appear to make, either consciously or unconsciously. This is the type of question that necessitates measures over a long period of time. It has been amply demonstrated that good day care can approximate the input of the "good middle class home." However, all studies of normal children in day care this author has seen are of recent vintage (in the last 5 years). We have little knowledge of what the long range impact of day care rearing is. We can look to other countries which have had day care for several decades, but we must keep in mind that there are strong emotional forces in this country -- perhaps not experienced in foreign lands -- which state that the good mother stays home and rears her own kids. Societal counterpressures in America may make such comparative longitudinal studies difficult to generalize to this country.

For the future of this generation of the poor we must ask if putting the mother to work, to participate in a major ethic in this country (with the aid of a day care facility), is as effective as

creating some form of home support for the mother in her child rearing efforts and establishing some other form of family financial support. This is a thorny question, particularly to ask of a program that is creating excitement as a solution to the welfare problem. Longitudinal studies dealing with mother-child relationships, the mother's sense of competence as a mother and as a job holder, the child's sense of competence as an effective agent in his environment...all will have to be done to answer the above question.[3]

Another general question related to this is what happens to a working mother in terms of her relationships with men. Ideally FAP is set up to get people off welfare, not to create a job force of working mothers.[4] Might we then ask whether FAP prevents the formation or reformation of the nuclear family by requiring mothers to work during the day and babysit at night. Some indication of this might be garnered from statistics on remarriage rates of mothers currently in the labor force. The basic intent for raising this issue, however, is to ask that we consider whether FAP will work against the establishment of the nuclear family and create a situation where it is more beneficial for a woman to work and let her child be raised by others. Not that the latter is necessarily bad, but if FAP is geared toward eventual financial stability, and if women are amongst the first to be laid off during lean years, prevention of the formation of a nuclear family may undermine the programs intent. One can also argue, of course, that getting mothers out into the community will increase their chances for remarriage and further stability. The question is open, but it perhaps should be investigated.

c. How does the FAP day care program fit into the larger social system?

Day care, as presently operated in this country, does not take care of problems that are created by job requirements. Few places operate on a 24 hour basis. It is highly likely, however, that formerly untrained labor with newly acquired skills will have an excellent opportunity to enter the job market in situations where the more skilled

---

[3]One of the author's concerns here is that large day care centers tend to be extremely bland -- i.e., safety and smooth scheduling become critical for the large day care administrator. To state it extremely, children are not challenged because they might get hurt. If the early years are formative, critical individuality could suffer in such a setting.

[4]This is not to imply that only divorced or unwed mothers will participate in FAP, but they will comprise a portion.

prefer not to work. Graveyard or swing shifts on factory assembly lines are two examples. Child care will, therefore, have to be provided at odd hours to enable mothers to take advantage of job opportunity. We can create no greater disservice than to train someone for a job that does not exist or that is unreachable because of realistic personal scheduling problems.

Also, few day care centers will, at present, take children who have moderate to severe illnesses. Measles, chicken pox, roseola, severe colds, etc. are typically not handled by day care facilities. The working mother must, therefore, find a friend or relative to sit with the child or, more typically, stay at home. If such services for ill children are not provided, it may appear that a job training program, even with day care, is not being effective when, in fact, the day care component is simply not relevant to the needs of a mother with a sick child. Program failures based on the above should be carefully delineated from other types of failures -- i.e., it is a failure of the day care component, not the individual, if he must withdraw because of a sick child.

Two other factors must be considered as well: the location of the day care center in relation to the mother's home and job, and the match between the mother's desires for her child and the day care center's goals for the child. In cities such as Los Angeles where public transportation is minimal and distances are great, getting a child to a day care facility, then to work, then back to pick up the child, and then home, can be exasperating and exhausting process. Day care will have to be offered in a convenient location for it to be worthwhile for the mother to use it. Also, page 5 of our handout, "Proposed Child Care Program Under the Family Assistance Act" states that initially 12% of all positions will be held by paraprofessionals form the "working poor" group, with a gradual increase to 65% at a later date. This implies that 88% of the beginning day care component will be staffed by professionals. (The author doubts this is possible, given the number of trained day care professionals in the field today.) If this initial goal can be achieved, it is more than likely that most of the professionals will not come from the same ethnic or SES background as the day care consumer. This may mean different "cultural" emphasis than that found in the child's local community. This may cause mothers to withdraw their children because they feel the child is not receiving the type of care that enhances his own self-concept, identity, or his neighborhood coping skills.

In data collection for FAP effectiveness we must be careful to delineate where the failure of the day care component has caused program withdrawal, as opposed to job training or individual failures. Day care can be a blessing or a curse, depending on whether it actually meets the needs created by a job training program as well as the personal needs of enrolled mother and child.

d. Does FAP reduce welfare rolls and decrease welfare problems?

This question is related to, but somewhat different than, the "gainfully employed" question. FAP is an alternative to "welfare" but it is still basically a welfare program. Congress would be wise to ask whether we have merely traded one hornet's nest for another. For, if FAP is as difficult to manage, as damaging to human dignity, and as ineffective in creating opportunity as the current system, we have gained very little by its inauguration. Here it will be important that statistics from the old and new programs be to some extent comparable so relevant comparisons can be made. We must ask questions such as: is one job training program effective in moving people out of FAP, or are we training people over and over again with no forward movement; are people who are eligible for the program and in need of the program being reached; is FAP in California the same as FAP in Florida, Mississippi, Illinois, and Massachusetts and by providing a new service, day care, are we creating a whole new set of problems, i.e., are all forms of day care provided equally used, equally relevant and equally effective in their impact on the child? Some of the questions relevant to this issue will be found under the headings of other interest groups, but their answers will be critical to the success of the program. One question likely to be raised as a "welfare problem" will be does the birth rate of FAP participants go down? A somewhat crass question, but part of the popular stereotype of the current welfare scene. Statistics will have to be carefully marshalled to counter the anticipated criticism that "All FAP is doing is encouraging indiscriminate family increase by providing care for children and freeing the mother from all childrearing responsibility."

2. Federal Level Program Administrators

a. What are the goals of the Day Care Program?

Of all the questions listed in this paper, this is undoubtedly the most crucial to answer. It will determine guidelines of the mother, but do not replace her as the prime child caretaker. The possible variations are great, but must be defined before the program can be evaluated.

Of course, the federal level has the option of not defining the goals of the program, but, instead, leaving this definition to state or local agencies or (preferably) parents. This would make it quite difficult, however, to compare local programs or states with one another. An issue to be faced, therefore, is who controls the program and the curriculum...the federal government or the state? The ultimate reality is, of course, that the local day care workers and parents control the program and curriculums because they have the responsibility for implementing it. Guidelines for staffing, expenditure ratios, and required program content, however, as outlined at the federal level, will place

an indelible stamp on the nature of FAP day care impact.

b. Who controls program planning?

We have already gotten into this in the above question, but if goals are defined, who then will have control over how those goals are to be reached. This basically is a question of process. How do we get to the goals once stated, and who controls how we get to the goals? The definition of goals can have a subtle impact on process. If goals are mainly scholastic or remedial, i.e., reading readiness, increased IQ, etc., a program can be easily developed which will look very much like a downward extension of the first grade. As mentioned above, many day care situations are terribly bland because of high insurance costs for travel, fear for safety, or, often, the fact that the building has other main uses, i.e., YWCA or a church basement. This type of situation lends itself well to a classroom type of curriculum. What then would not be provided would be the multitude of experiences the child at home has in his own neighborhood. The tighter the curriculum and/or the goals, the less likely a day care staff is to see meal preparation, the plumber unplugging the toilet, the trip to the grocery store, as "educational experiences." In this author's opinion, this would, indeed, be a disaster.

Also, control of process brings up the whole question of research measurement. Research is more easily done if all children undergo some common experience, the outcome of which is then measured. The imposition of curriculum for research should be handled with caution, particularly on a national basis. Outcome can be subtly sabotaged by program leaders if they do not understand or agree with the particular research goal. Yet general measures, such as IQ, vocabulary, physical motor coordination in no way isolate the critical variables leading to excellence in the particular area under observation. This, in turn, perhaps enables one to say that day care does not harm a child and, in fact, may raise his IQ a bit, but it does not say whether getting him away from his mother, his neighborhood, or a particular curriculum innovation was responsible for his well being. The setting of goals and the control of educational process both, therefore, have implications for the relevance of various types of measures (viz. the Westinghouse vs Kirschner reports about the impact of Headstart).

c. <u>How is FAP day care program eligibility to be determined?</u>

There is a stigma attached to welfare or being on welfare in this country. FAP will probably have some of that stigma transferred to it. If the day care component of FAP turns into another way of putting poor kids into an "institutional ghetto," the program is unlikely to have much beneficial impact. Zigler has argued persuasively for mixing children of various SES backgrounds in Headstart; Karnes also has data that indicates that a SES mix leads to better performance in young children. If FAP day

care is only for mothers in the training program, it is very likely going to be a homogeneous group in the area of SES...almost by definition it has to be.

The question then must be asked as to how one goes about creating a day care mix for the FAP program. This will have to be put in guidelines from the federal level.

d. What types of research should be done for the gathering of required information, and what types of research should generally be permitted.

Much of the population eligible for FAP are old hands at being pushed and prodded and studied by academic types. In some communities it is almost impossible to do research with minority groups because of their general displeasure at being studied but not helped, and with what many consider "racist results and conclusions" being drawn from the research. The whole point of this conference is to establish broad research guidelines; they should be related to goals and so the cautions listed under 2-a must be considered. Further, there is the question of how much impact a researcher can or should have on curriculum.

From the researcher's point of view, an area of larger anticipation, and where the federal government will have to exercise some caution, is work with infants. Infant studies are on the increase and their importance is unquestionable. Infants, however, are somewhat difficult to find, particularly if the researcher does not wish to have a concerned mother constantly hovering in the background. FAP day care for infants will be a prize holding area for those who wish to study infants, and it would not be at all surprising if such centers were flooded with requests for observation and experimentation time with children under two. Since children of this age are totally dependent upon adult attention, and cannot go home bearing tales of "what happened in day care today," some fairly well thought out protective devices will have to be established and careful guidelines written to prevent infants and toddlers from being used.

Research will, therefore, have to be guided so as not to alienate the people being served. Also some responsibility will have to be exercised as to the types of questions asked and the way findings are handled.

e. What happens to the parental authority role when day care and job training are provided?

Regardless of what child care arrangements are made, parents in the USA are still held legally and morally responsible for the behavior of their children. A question arising out of a day care situation is

what happens to the parent-child relationship when someone else has responsibility for the day-to-day nitty-gritty of child rearing. Do parents with children in day care maintain a feeling of control over the child's destiny, or do they abandon their parental perogatives to others. Proponents of the kubbutz system argue that "day care" frees the parents to share largely "happy times" with their children. They are not frazzled at the end of a day with 15 hours of childrearing, but come to look forward with eagerness to those evening contacts, as do their children, when experiences of the day are shared, and typical family strife is minimized. The Israeli culture is, in part, at least set up to support this type of attitude; the American culture is not yet at that point. To state it somewhat dramatically, day care could destroy family life as we know it today. The author does not believe the previous statement, but it will undoubtedly be an issue raised. It would be a mistake to believe that all FAP participants will find day care to their liking. In Los Angeles, with its large Chicano community, day care facilities in barrios are frequently under-populated because the Chicano culture puts strong pressures on the mother to stay at home and rear her own children. Methods of dealing with cultural pressures will have to be built into the program and, frankly, the best built-in method may well be parental control. Guidelines can aid in close day care/parent cooperation so the parent does not feel alienated from childrearing input. Parent/day care worker conferences can be required; a parental Board of Directors could be established; time from job-training for the mother to be in the center with her child could be encouraged. Possibly one of the most effective devices could be an end of the day precis of the child's activities for the parent of the day care worker. This becomes particularly critical for pre-verbal and "just-verbal" children: when the communication pattern for past events is limited between mother and child a mutual sharing is most difficult. As an example, after a day's work the author appeared at home to be greeted by one of his 19 month-old twin sons who ran to a corner of the living room, pointed at the corner and kept repeating BORSH, BORSH, BORSH! Daddy kept repeating, What, What, What?! This exercise in mutual frustration was solved when mother made an appearance and after a moment's observation said that he was talking about a school bus he had seen on a nearby street corner which was in the direction of that particular corner of the living room. Imagine the potential frustration of a parent/child interaction if there were no one there to provide the continuity of the day's events. A day-end conference will not cover all bases, but will give the mother a context in which to interpret. The same, of course, also works when a mother tells the day care worker of the child's weekend and evening activities. The point here being that unless carefully programmed, day care could be a devisive exercise for family cohesiveness. Also, if the mother views herself as a mother and a job holder, and the mother role begins to disintegrate in her own eyes, then the job is likely to suffer. The above is a question which will necessitate a longitudinal approach, but the answer may well be critical to a public view of day care in this country in the future.

f. For whom is the program ineffective?

It seems a characteristic of human nature that we do not care to examine our failures too closely; this is particularly true if we have promised splendid results in the beginning. If anything, we tend to lay the failure of the program not on ourselves but on some fault in the people it served. FAP will not work for all families, and it will be important to know why so we can design a program which will be effective in meeting their needs. We have already mentioned such things as cultural pressures, the feeling of being alienated from one's children, or a difference in goals between home and day care facility. The day care component will obviously have to be structured so as to provide family support and job support; it should not function as the single divisive link between home and work.

g. How is the unit of community for the day care component to be defined?

The answer to this question will determine, in large part how relevant the day care service will be to the FAP mother in training. If the day care program is geographically distant or on the other side of the track or in a neighborhood of different ethnicity, it will not be as convenient or relevant to the mother as one in her own neighborhood which can be easily reached. Also, if, as is likely, the mother has several children and day care and after-school services are allocated to different "communities," the mother will frequently be faced with a burdensome logistical problem. In California, unless a mother of 3 children (ages 1 year, 5 years and 9 years) can find a good family day care home which will handle all 3 children on a day care/after-school care basis, she is faced with the problem of spreading them around the community. She must place them in situations that are geared to handle that particular age child. Few full day care centers offer after-school care as well. At the end of a work day, therefore, she must run all over town to pick up her children, and in the Los Angeles area this nearly always necessitates an automobile as public transportation is either non-existent or infrequent. If geographic proximity is impossible, then a pick-up and drop-off service is a possibility, but it is quite expensive if one is chauffeuring over 7 children in a vehicle (in California, at least). Another possible blessing for day care being close to home is that neighbors can give running reports of what they have seen happening. Obviously this is a double-edged sword in that neighborhood disapproval can quickly destroy a family's confidence in a day care program. It would also be possible to attach the day care center to the job training site if mothers were being trained in groups, but this might not serve after-school care if it is far away from the family's neighborhood and would pose a problem if the mother were to go to another area for on-the-job training.

h. What happens to mothers who stay on welfare or continue under the FAP program without taking a job?

This, like the question of why do mothers drop out of the program, has to do with assessing those instances where the program has failed to have the desired impact on people. On the basis of probabilities, one would expect the program not to work for all people. Should this percentage be larger than anticipated, some information should be available to give clues as to why the failure.

i. Are the prime grantees and their delegate agencies expending funds according to published guidelines and in a manner most beneficial to the populations served?

An obvious question for which OCD and other federal agencies have current answers. It will be applicable here as it has been with other programs, hopefully with fewer exceptions slipping through the federal "overseeing network."

3. Prime Grantees and Their Delegate Agencies

a. How stable is FAP day care funding?

Seasoned hands from previous government programs, such as Headstart, will probably ask this question first, and with good reason. There are two ways to cut an annual budget: 1) reduce the funds from one year to the next; and 2) keep the funds stable over the years while the cost of the program increases with the cost of living. Both forms prove most anxiety provoking to administrators and have been quite demoralizing to Headstart operators. Also, when speaking of stability, the issue of renewability is raised. A question will probably be, "Will we have to spend half of each year writing a funding proposal for the next, or are we assured of continuing yearly support (assuming we do the job adequately) with a minimum of red tape and grant applications? Will money be awarded on a per capita basis, or will each program have to submit its own budget for verification?" Day care, above the custodial level, is not cheap; the program will be expensive, particularly if 24 hour care is offered. An additional hazard will be that if welfare mothers are trained through the FAP to be day care workers and return to staff the FAP day care centers which served them, their jobs and the relevance of their training will be conditional on the continuation of FAP day care facilities. The program then will be supporting working mothers at two levels: paying their salaries and caring for their children. If day care training is to be a FAP program, then, if nothing else, the government has some moral obligation to continue to keep these jobs open.

Professionals and paraprofessionals who work directly and continuously with children are a curious breed who perhaps have been taken advantage of by society. They, typically, work for more "love" than money, and it is probably safe to assume that the FAP day care components will be staffed by these well meaning people regardless of how realistic the funding is. This has certainly been the case with Headstart. We would hope that even if personnel are easy to come by and relatively cheap that a close look will be taken at the salary leve. and stability of funding, on a moral basis if no other.

Further, if on a year-to-year basis day care facilities and services are coming and going on the economic whims of Washington, the sense of well-being and psychological security on the part of the FAP mothers will be severely hampered and could have negative impact on the effectiveness of the training program. In our current day care situation a major complaint and source of anxiety for the consumer is the instability of small day care operations. A family day care home, because of the small number of children it can handle, must rely on a reasonably full capacity to make the effort worthwhile. If a family day care mother anticipates 7 children and winds up with 2, she frequently shuts up shop and leaves the consumer high and dry. The location of a new day care facility is an arduous and emotionally exhausting process which requires time away from work.[6] Stability of funding will lead to stability of day care services which, in turn, will free the mother to focus on her job rather than worry about her child's welfare.

b. What will the staff qualifications be?

To put it quite simply, there are not now enough qualified and experienced day care professionals and paraprofessionals to staff day care centers already existing. A nursery school or elementary teacher may be a close approximation to a qualified day care professional, but day care is not just a 3 hour nursery program stretched out over a 12 to 15 hour day. It is infinitely more complex and has quite a different set of requirements (stamina, if nothing else). Staff qualifications will therefore have to be examined extremely carefully. One must walk the line between setting standards so low that wholly incompetent people can care for children or so high that the position cannot

[6] The tendency to stay with a center that one is accustomed to has made it difficult for several commercial day care ventures in California to get off the ground. Cost analyses are usually done for about 80% occupancy. Frequently, when these centers open their doors they fill quite slowly because mothers are reluctant to move from their present circumstances, no matter how inferior. Unless the franchises have planned for a gradual occupancy rate they find themselves in financial difficulties before the center has an opportunity to "take" within the community.

be filled. In many cases it will be trial and error, with blind leading the blind. This is not necessarily unworkable as we are convinced that true education for children or adults emerges from the process of achieving goals, not from the goals themselves.

A massive training effort will have to be mounted, but even that will be hampered by the limited number of academics and other experienced personnel in the field of day care. If we can play on past experience, the FAP program, like Headstart, the Peace Corps and others will undoubtedly begin suddenly with an "it should all be done by yesterday" feeling. Initial gearing up, therefore, will require flexible requirements of staff qualifications.

Administrators will undoubtedly want to know whether they are required to hire FAP trainees in day care or whether they will be given the greater flexibility of finding their own staff.

c. If I am working on federal money, must I be licensed by the state? or Do I need to be licensed?

Licensing is a very thorny issue. The author can best speak from his experience in California. One city in metropolitan Los Angeles has 136 licensed day care homes and it is estimated that there are 3 times that many unlicensed homes. Licensing, from the small family day care operator's point of view, provides two things: respectability and permission to advertise in the newspaper. It also has with it the multitude of required inspections from the fire department, the Department of Social Services (DPSS), etc. Often these departments give conflicting orders as to codes (i.e., Fire Department: "Put that latch low on the gate so children can get out of the yard in case of fire; DPSS: "Put that latch high on the gate so children can't open it and wander out into the street.) DPSS is required to grant or deny a license within 90 days of application. In some communities they are so understaffed that this is humanly impossible, so either the day care center cannot open or opens anyway and ignores licensing. California is, in fact, well ahead of other states in child day care services. Yet, if its plight is indicative of the "good" end of the continuum, it is frankly highly unlikely that if a rash of FAP day care facilities opened in a state, with licensing required by that state, very few would be "legal" if operating. If FAP day care were to come under state jurisdiction for licensing it is very likely that many would not open when needed, the licensing process is so slow.

Because of the above, most small day care operations operate outside the law and the state is forced to look the other way. Massive federal support to state licensing agencies would be necessary if FAP day care operations were to come under state jurisdiction. Again, given the relative speed with which FAP is likely to be launched and

the time it would take for a licensing department to gear up, movement would not be fast. And, even then, one has the fire department and others to cope with as well.

d. Who has responsibility for program quality, the administrator or someone else?

This question will probably be answered if those raised in this paper at the federal level are answered.

e. How "efficient" does the program have to be?

By efficiency is meant how conscious of cost accounting must the administrator be. Several franchised day care centers have found that it is cheaper to have a caterer prepare meals, wheel a truck up to a center, and pop a box lunch into the hands of each child. This is, indeed, efficient from a cost accounting basis, but it tends to horrify old hands in the day care field (whether they are right or not is an open question). Experienced day care operators argue that a kitchen with a cook provides a wealth of experiences for children who can observe food preparation, participate in the preparation and, in essence, get some feel for what is the heart of most households. Also, a morning in the kitchen with the cook for a grumpy child who disintegrates too frequently in the larger day care setting is a commonly used pacifier. The kitchen is taken as an example only, but cost accounting efficiency vs educational potential can be easily cited in other areas. Some will argue that efficiency and quality, while not mutually exclusive, are strange educational bedfellows. Careful guidelines should be established in this area and some examination will be necessary to determine whether the least expensive program is also educationally rich.

f. Who will be responsible for parent education?

This question may be a euphemism for who has control over the parent and the placement of her child: the job training administrator or the day care administrator. Friction is likely if the day care operator has no control over who enters his center and who is referred elsewhere. The child-oriented types staffing day care facilities may have a very different orientation toward the consumer than will her job coordinator, however. They may wish to council, for instance, that the child not be placed in day care immediately because he is not ready or that the mother spend a few hours each morning for a few days in the center with her child to make the separation a bit less traumatic for both parties. This type of suggestion may interfere with job training schedules and otherwise reduce the efficiency of the job training program. Who has control?

g. Who has authority over day care space?

Many day care programs, particularly those that serve large numbers of children (30 and above) are limited in their effectiveness because they occupy space intended for another purpose. Most typically, this is the Sunday School portion of a church. Although these enclaves may be nicely designed for the teaching of religion, they usually do not lend themselves well to 12 hours use by a large number of children. Further, more typically, everything has to be picked up and put away Friday night so Sunday School can use the same space Sunday morning. Much staff time is wasted assembling and disassembling rooms and occasionally arguing or pleading with church officials for a shift in policy here or the granting of a variance there. Administrators will feel even more protective of their day care environment if they are permitted to remodel with government funds. An easing of such situations could be brought about by clear guidelines as to the required balance of the relationship between lessor and lessee at the beginning of their relationship.

h. Who controls the allotment of services?

Our handout cities five types of day care arrangements: in-house care, family day care homes, group day care homes, day care centers and combinations of home and group care. If a prime grantee should control all or several of these services in an area, who then is empowered to assign parents to the type of care, or do parents state the type of care they wish for their child? Should there be guidelines for this type of decision? One may also question whether all ltypes of care should be available to each FAP area. For instance, in terms of expense, there is already a large network of family day care homes (licensed and unlicensed) in most states. Day care centers are limited in number. The question would then be, should we plug in and improve already existing services, or should new services be created? Infants require a different type of care than 5 year olds, as do 9 year olds. Will assignment be made in terms of availability or need, or by whom?

4. Researchers[7]

a. Are the FAP day care services available to be researched, and if so what are the limitations, if any?

[7] It seems almost useless to anticipate the questions research people will ask as each individual will probably have his own particular interest. There are some questions, however, that should be asked and, if not, then paid to be asked and these are listed below. Obviously research will have to be conducted on the majority of questions anticipated for other interest groups.

This author assumes that day care facilities will be open to researchers, even those with questions not relevant to the goals or intent of the day care program. If we can learn from our Headstart experience, however, it may be wise to exert some control over the research use of FAP day care. Much has been promised by researchers in the past, often to merely gain entre to the population they desired. As a result, those studied -- particularly minority groups -- have become extremely cautious about being studied and quite concerned about how the information gathered and its results are used. To protect children and families in the program, it may be wise for the government or the researchers to attempt to monitor the research routes. If some control is not used we may find ourselves totally excluded from many communities. As mentioned above, infant day care programs need to approach research with particular caution; they will review many requests for access to their charges, and bear a greater responsibility for wise judgment, given the helplessness of infants. Other relevant research questions will be listed below with abbreviated commentary.

a. What is the impact on the child of the particular type of day care environment he occupies?

b. Does a sense of effectance in the community change for the child or the parents?

c. Does the parents' feeling about confidence in their child's future increase?

d. What is the most effective way to keep communication flowing between mother and day care worker.

e. Does the mother/child relationship improve, remain the same, or worsen after a child is put in day care?

f. What types of children are most benefited by what type of day care?

g. What is a good infant curriculum beyond typical custodial care?

h. Is what is learned in day care by the child transferable to his own neighborhood?

i. Does the center and the home match in values and if they differ what is the impact on the parent/child relationship?

j. Does day care weaken or strengthen the maternal bond?

k. Does day care turn out children with any characteristic personality traits?

l. Do day care and non day care children differ in later school performance?

m. What are disease patterns in day care situations? (Recent reports indicate that there is no cause for concern if reasonable every-day precautions are taken.)

n. (Is the child's IQ raisec, or are his readiness skills enhanced, or are his cognitive capabilities augmented?) The author brackets the above intentionally, as it is inevitable that these questions will be asked; but we greet them with very mixed feelings. This type of question is so popular and so automatic that it can easily overshadow other critical issues and, in fact, shape the program into yet another remedial or hot-house forcing exercise. They should not be permitted to dominate the research effort.

5. Parents

Many parental questions will be similar to those already asked by other groups above. Again, they will be listed below without elaboration.

a. Will day care equal or better the care my child will get at home?

b. How will I know what is happening to him?

c. Am I being a "good mother" by letting someone else rear my child?

d. Will he learn anything?

e. How will what happens at the day care center relate or be relevant to what goes on at home or in the neighborhood?

f. Will he outgrow me?

g. Are there people qualified to take care of my child?

h. Is there other day care available so when I can't use FAP day care anymore I can still keep my job?

i. Who will take care of him when he is really sick?

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS: OCD EVALUATION CONFERENCE

Dr. James Abert
Deputy Assistant Secretary for
Evaluation & Monitoring
Room 5524, DHEW North
Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

Miss Barbara Bates
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street, S.W. (Box 1182)
Washington, D.C. 20013

Dr. Lois-ellin Datta
Conference Chairman
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street,S.W. (Box 1182)
Washington, D.C. 20013

Dr. John Dill
Institute for Developmental Studies
New York University
New York, New York 10003

Dr. Francis Dunham
Faculty of Psychology
University of West Florida
Pensacola, Florida 32504

Mr. Neil Gibson
Commerce Tower
Kansas City, Missouri 64199

Mr. Sam Granato
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street, S.W. (Box 1182)
Washington, D.C. 20013

Dr. Harry Grace
609-19th Street
Santa Monica, California 90402

Dr. Edith Grotberg
Office of Economic Opportunity
1200-19th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506

Dr. Robert La Crosse (President)
Pacific Oaks College
Pasadena, California

Dr. Irving Lazar
Associate Director, Early Childhood
Appalachian Regional Commission
1616 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20235

Dr. Francis Palmer
Provost State University of New York
Stonybrook,Long Island, New York

Dr. David Pollen
Bureau of Research
Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Kenneth Rainey
Appalachian Regional Commission
1616 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20235

Mrs. Eileen Siedman
Systems Development Corporation
5720 Columbia Pike
Falls Church, Virginia 22401

Dr. Earl Schaefer
National Institute of Mental Health
5454 Wisconsin Avenue (NIMH,Rm WT-312)
Chevy Chase, Maryland 20015

Mrs. Cecelia Suarez
Department of Education
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Miss Sheila Sullivan
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street, S.W. (Box 1182)
Washington, D.C. 20013

Participants: OCD Eval. Conference continued

Mr. Mark Thompson
57 Packard Avenue
West Sommerville, Massachusetts
02144

Dr. Joseph S. Wholey
Urban Institute
2100 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C.

Mr. Sidney Rosendorf
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street, S.W.
P.O. Box 1182
Washington, D.C. 20013

APPENDIX D-1

NOTES TAKEN AT
OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT DAY CARE EVALUATION CONFERENCE
November 5-6, 1970

NOTE: The following notes were taken to provide material for writing a brief summary of the conference, to be distributed to participants and possibly to some publications in the early childhood field. The notes therefore cover only the highlights of the conference, and many details are not included. Sidney Rosendorf, Division of Publications, Office of Child Development

Dr. Datta described the audiences to which we are accountable:

1. Congress, which must decide where the money will go
2. Program operators at Federal and local levels
3. Parents, the consumers of day care
4. Researchers in early childhood education, welfare, etc.

"We should prepare for the future--not wait till it comes upon us."

Mr. Granato:

A national system of day care services Federally-funded will come, whether the FAP program is passed or not.

FAP day care will be for those who need it for employment purposes. Program will not be funded like Head Start; funding will probably be divided between agencies. One possible division: SRS to provide purchase and management of vendor payment programs. OCD to develop policy, procedures, materials, and to provide seed grants for new day care centers.
We do not know the budget now; or whether it will cover child development or custodial care only; or all eligibility requirements; or which agencies will fund the program.

(blackboard chart)

A) For states, State Prime Grantee would be public or private non-profit agency.
planner, coordinator, monitor, not operator.
selected by Federal Govt. or Governor.
could possibly be a 4-C agency.

or State Welfare Agency

B) For cities with over 250,000 pop., Local Prime Grantee would operate independently and exactly as State Prime Grantees do.

or Local Welfare Agency

Grants to Prime Grantees:

Phase I: planning grants for 6 months, to plan program
Phase II: administrative, one-time seed money, vendor payments

Tasks of Prime Grantee for Phase I:

1. will determine number of children to be included, resources currently available and funds needed to operate program.
2. will certify all programs (day care standards will be set up; may or may not be current interagency standards.)
3. will collect fees and pay vendors (if split management, State Welfare would handle.)
4. will develop state training program for area-wide in-service training; staffs of every certified program could participate; program might be run by contractor, and would be part free, part on fee basis.
5. will plan medical and dental program for the children in day care.
6. will set up accounts system: administrative, grants (seed grants), accounts to pay vendors.

Notes:

- Parents will decide which day care facility they want (unlike Head Start where must use Head Start center).
- Payments: day care facilities will bill Prime Grantee and receive one payment for all children in their programs; Prime Grantee will pay them an agreed rate and will collect fees from parents; rates will be set on a local basis: local costs, services provided, etc.
- Vendors to receive 80-100% of start-up costs for first 3 months, then reduced planning money for the second 3 months, then they will be on their own.
- For construction and renovation, there would be limited funds, and a priority list would be set up.
- If a Prime Grantee does not perform well, Federal Government could select another local or regional agency.

Dr. LaCrosse:

"The day care component in FAP may cost more than the job slots, which makes it open to pot shots."

In California there is an 8-1 child-staff ratio, including aides.

Dr. Lazar:

Suggests these basic questions in evaluations:

1. Efficiency of administration, costs of operation.
2. Effects on people.

Feels Congress is prime consumer of evaluation. Also state governors and mayors must be provided information.

Feels day care cannot control employability of mothers; that is based on economic factors.

Dr. Datta:

1. We are concerned with FAP day care, not the FAP program.
2. Our concern evaluation, not research.
3. We want priority questions, short and long range.
4. We need a 5-year plan: measures, designs.
   - Evaluation measures achievements of a program to yield policy decisions.
   - Research provides knowledge needed by different audiences.

Dr. Dill:

Suggests these audiences:
Congress, employers, prime grantees, program operators, parents, and children.

Dr. Lazar: (blackboard chart)

Administration
efficiency - auspices, structure, program and staff
costs
Quality - conformance to standards, goals
Inputs - programs, parents, children
Effects - on children, parents, social institutions

Acceptance
by parents and children: turnover
staff: stability
communities: local money supplied
employers
professional community: researchers
public officials, Congress
day care operators
the general public

Dr. Palmer: Whether the program is custodial or not, we will have to evaluate the educational effects on child and family.

Dr. Datta: We should examine a moderate evaluation program: what are the priorities? What is the budget needed? ½ of 1% to 3% of total program cost are usual Federal Government allotments for evaluation.

Dr. Grace: It costs much more for evaluation to be used in immediate decisions. In HEW-type evaluations, you let the program proceed and evaluate it at a leisurely pace, to see how it goes; this costs far less.

Mr. Gibson: Data processing should be brought in. A tape should be established for each child "to account for his dollars." We should decide what we want to include in the tape: family profile, money spent on child, why child dropped out, etc. We should include such simple mechanisms in evaluation; they add little to costs.

Dr. Datta: suggests that we divide into two groups:

1. Congress, Administration, Program Operators, Administrative Decisions - Dr. Wholey, chairman
2. Outcomes of concern to parents, public - Dr. LaCrosse, chairman

****

Group 2 - on Outcomes

Dr. Palmer: We cannot impose the program from above; what is needed locally will be important.

Dr. Dunham: We should not promise to change children upward. We should try to show that the program is not damaging the children, that removing child from his family will not hurt him.

Dr. Palmer: We are using cognitive measures based on middle class values--IQs, etc.--trend will be to measure in new ways from now on.
Summative evaluation sums up national trends; data is not effective on all levels (has been used for Congress).
Formative evaluation measures progress at local level and helps in planning.
Emphasis to now has been on the summative type; we should continue this but put new stress on formative evaluation.

Dr. Schaefer: We should be concerned about the child at home as well as in the day care center. Questions:

Medical and health care:
- Is there adequate referral?
- Is medical care adequate; is it utilized?
- Is psychiatric help provided for children who don't adjust to day care?

Cognitive:
- Musical and artistic talent
- Sensitivity and commitment to society
- Political and social leadership

Dr. Gill: It is difficult to compare different types of day care: group, home, etc. We should cut down expectations of the public that day care can do a better job than parents can.

Dr. Palmer: Each consumer group must set and specify its own goals - and be evaluated on that basis.

Mrs. Siedman: There are minimums in day care: child should be safe, warm, should get kind attention, etc.; no harm should be done to the child.

(Discussion continued on measures, goals, and questions to be asked. Dr. LaCrosse led the discussion and recorded suggestions of the group. These were covered in his summary report given on Nov. 6--see later pages of these notes.)

Second Session, Friday, November 6

Dr. Palmer: Summative evaluation has turned out badly--for example, the Westinghouse Report on Head Start.

It appears that FAP day care programs will be custodial at first; we will have to show that the children are not suffering any harm, although some programs may do damage.

Summative evaluation is what we are used to in Government, but it is like looking over the project's shoulder. Some problems involved:

1. It threatens the people studied; they put on their best face.
2. Although the evaluators may be unbiased, they will not always get true results.

Day care programs will vary greatly; it will be difficult to set measures, yet standardized measures are indispensable for comparing communities.

In summative evaluation, we should select measures for evaluation that are not sensitive to examiner bias (IQ tests have great examiner bias in testing children of this age).

Summative evaluation is done in response to questions planned outside local programs--for Congress, for OCD, for the public, etc.

Formative evaluation is personal (it has the drawbacks of examiner bias, too). It lets local programs evaluate themselves continuously; does a better job in improving a program than summative evaluation does; provides immediate feedback. It is private, done by the people of each project.

Formative evaluation needs:

1. A group that will ask honest questions about itself.
2. A group that will set goals to fit its own

requirements.

3. A program with a design (the possibility of setting up a control group for comparison is nil). He feels that private, formative evaluation is needed for these day care programs.

Dr. Lazar: We should set up program with normal goals (child's height, weight, reading ability, etc.); then set up records to let us know if the child is being hurt. We can say, "We don't want kids to be hurt. We'll help you. These are simple measures. If a kid is not gaining weight, something is wrong."

We can agree on what is hurting children more easily than on what is helping them. We'll measure these things, within local variables:

1. height, weight, disease.
2. vocabulary size and increase (easy to measure)
3. weaning, toilet training.

These are simple indicators to show if children are in trouble. In Appalachian program centers, they work cooperatively with grantees and do not "throw the rascals out" if mistakes are made; the centers criticize themselves because they are not afraid of punitive measures.

Mrs. Siedman: Planning and evaluation on local level can go on continuously, so the program can change constantly on a day-to-day basis.

Dr. Dunham: Make local evaluations a joint enterprise between local day care centers and OCD, so the centers will cooperate locally; check sheets will help them.

Dr. Pollen: Suggests working out a check list in Washington, D.C.--as a project using local centers.

Mrs. Siedman: Day care operator training should include training in self-analysis.

Dr. LaCrosse: Day care is a lonely occupation; we should tell operators what others in the field are doing.

Dr. Datta: Where day care centers need help, check lists will alert operators; OCD will then send in help and technical assistance as needed to meet problems.

Dr. Lazar: With formative evaluation, we can get a status report at any time to measure what is happening nationally; reports can be submitted to Congress on a quarterly basis.

Mr. Gibson: This will give us a chance to present the facts. We can ask Congress: Are you satisfied with the program? If we have problems, we can ask: Will you give us more money to solve them?

Dr. Lazar: OEO, OCD and Model Cities promise the moon; the lack of credibility cuts appropriations in Congress. Agencies presenting data on what is wrong often get money from the Government.

Dr. Datta: "Distant early warning systems" can be set up. We can concentrate on custodial care for the first 1-2 years; then when we show that the administrative system is doing a good job, we can ask Congress for more funds for expansion of day care into child development areas.

After 1-2 years, we can go to Congress and say: "We are not harming the children; we are using our funds well; can we expand the program?"

Mrs. Suarez: Prime grantees should be accountable, too, not just local vendors.

Dr. Dunham: There will be a high staff turnover; we should study why--the continuity of child care is important.

Dr. LaCrosse: Day care centers have long hours, low pay; the turnover may be due to poor working conditions.

Mrs. Siedman: OCD should seek new ways of using volunteers and other personnel, and should find out what are the needs of the staff.

Dr. Grace: Training in evaluation would be important in day care and helpful in custodial care; the training would create interest among the staff and teach them where to go for help.

Mrs. Suarez: We should train supervisors, too.

Dr. Palmer: We should recommend formative evaluation to OCD - and also technical assistance for this evaluation:

- We should keep instructions simple and not send 50-page memo on keeping their books.
- We should draw up a list of measures and use them in pilot studies to find out (for use in summative evaluation):
  1. Effect of bias of evaluators on results; compare men and women evaluators, black and white, etc.; find out is Measure A subject to bias, is Measure B?
  2. Reactions of day care operators to the measures: which measures are least subject to examiner bias (no existing data on this now)? Which measures are most acceptable?

He estimates we could do this research for $150,000.

Dr. Lazar: We should work out a list of flags to show possible trouble spots.

Mr. Gibson: Get the reporting system set up early and test it before the day care programs start nationally.

Dr. Grace: Do a study on the signs and signals that day care operators use today: what they use and what they do as a result of their findings.

Mr. Thompson: We need to find means to communicate evaluation results nationally. Regional meetings are expensive; we need other means of information-sharing.

Dr. Palmer: We must explain and sell formative evaluation to local day care staffs.

Dr. Datta: Legislation provides CDTA and other funds for technical assistance and training, and research.

Mrs. Suarez: Chicano kids are difficult to measure: they feel a cultural handicap, and feel that their culture is wrong even at age 4, whether the tests are in English or Spanish.

Dr. Palmer: Summative evaluation must show whether the children are making progress; it is not for comparisons across races and groups.

Dr. Schaefer: We should ask: Are we hurting families and communities, as well as children.

Mr. Gibson: During the first years, let's use simple measures.

Dr. Schaefer: Studies showing effect of Head Start on the family and the community are among the best things to come out of Head Start.

Dr. Palmer: There is no educational component in the day care bill. We will probably start with custodial day care and measure whether we are hurting the children. We are removing them from their families; we owe it to the taxpayers to show that we are not hurting these children.

For once, let's do more than we promise.

Dr. Grace: We are setting up a new institution--day care. What will its effect be on all groups: the community, the state, the poor (will they think this a new type of oppression?).

What will the impacts be on non certified day care homes?

Dr. Lazar: 90 percent of day care in the U.S. is private. Many programs are in existence; we must open up FAP day care to these programs -- not exclude them if they don't meet all criteria.

Afternoon Session, Friday, November 6

Dr. Wholey, reporting on the Group One discussion held on Thursday, November 5. He presented a written summary of the group discussion and added these points:

1. His group emphasized that evaluation should be designed to help people running the programs, not just for the information of Congress.
2. Monitoring is important early in the program.
3. Two kinds of monitoring were suggested: (1) facts, (2) site visits (there have not been enough of these visits in most Federal programs).
4. Prime grantees should be compared with their approximate equals: industrial states with other industrial states, agricultural states with other agricultural states, cities of similar size, etc.
   We should not always monitor along HEW regional lines.
5. Should there be incentives for prime grantees -- for example, construction money? (Granato mentioned a limited pool of money for construction.)

Mr. Gibson: feels that OCD will have difficulty managing 150-250 "states" (i.e., prime grantees); monitoring should be taken on by an outside organization.

Dr. Palmer: Site visits are threatening and accomplish little. Technical assistance visits are better in finding out what is wrong.

Dr. LaCrosse: reported on the Group Two discussion of Thursday, November 5.

Each day care group should select its own goals.
How are they arrived at? How are they met?
Questions developed by his group:

For Children

1. Nutrition - Is diet adequate?
   Are non-nutritional aspects of food part of program?
2. Health Care - Is medical, dental, mental care adequate?
   Are health services adequate?
   Frequency of private medical attention?
   Is there good referral system?

3. Cognitive:
   a. Does child have opportunity to:
      communicate by oral or graphic means?
      interact with an adult without distraction?
      develop social responsibility?
      develop musical and cultural abilities?
      develop political (neighborhood) leadership & coping skills?
      develop a variety of styles of analysis?
      adapt to new situations?
      make rule-breaking decisions?
   b. Are there adequate provisions for individual differences in children? Does program allow for ethnic and cultural differences?

For Parents

1. Does center strengthen, support and not harm the family role?
2. Is parent informed of his right to participate and made aware of community activities?
3. Does program support neighborhood groups?
4. Are fathers involved?
5. Can all children be put in one center?

For Staff

1. Is there an adequate program supervisor?
2. Is there in-service training?
3. Is staff stable? Who leaves?
4. Is there continuity of child care?
5. Are there career growth possibilities for staff?
6. Does staff reflect ethnic and cultural background of the children?
7. Is there a ripple effect on other children in the family?
8. Is there a knowledge of the ethics of day care, of what other centers are doing?

For Community

1. Is it offered support?
2. How does it react to FAP employment of women?
3. Has FAP created services for the community?

Dr. Lazar presented a chart on the blackboard:

Administration/Indicators	Formative/Clinical
Status	Formulating program plans
Program comparison	Reporting
Damage	Feedback
Technical Assistance and information	Dissemination
Longitudinal studies	Supplements (local program variations)
Monitoring	Quality Control
Accountability	

Dr. Palmer: Centers change as they go along; so do parents.

Dr. Lazar: We can give a list of goals to grantees and let them select their goals; they are required to set goals and evaluate them. There must be minimum goals of nutrition, health, etc.--but we should not tell them how to run the programs.

Dr. Palmer: There will be some bizarre programs at the start. We should offer to send help if requested; let the centers bring problems to administrators, they must learn for themselves. The Government can't run so many homes and centers.

We must demand certain requirements at the start, but we should not watch them too much.

Dr. Dunham: Tell the centers that they must have at least 1 or more goals in each goal area; then let them choose.

Dr. LaCrosse: Give people a wide range of goals based on their own values. What is normal in Washington is not normal in San Diego ghetto, or in an Amish area.

Dr. Schaefer: We should require that we be able to monitor any project, so that we have an open--not a closed--system.

Dr. Palmer: There should be 3 stages:

1. The information would be obtained through evaluation.
2. The evaluation would show that no harm was done in the early months of the program.
3. We would find there are programs that cost more to do more; we could say to Congress, "We'll need this much money to do this kind of job."

Dr. Lazar: We should have simple-to-gather indicators that would send up a flag if there is trouble, so we can investigate.

In FAP we have involuntary day care for the first time--a public decision to remove children from their parents; we have an obligation to show that they are not hurt.

Dr. Schaefer: Many day care centers have no disturbed children; are they weeded out? We should find out why children are left out of a program, and why they drop out.

Dr. Pollen: He has been planning a day care center for 100 children for 2 years. Many problems are involved: are vendor payment checks made on time? in advance? (A vendor can go out of business if the administration is bad). What are the facilities, the training, evaluation, etc.

Dr. Palmer: We need regional demonstration centers to train day care people.

Dr. Datta in summary:

1. Formulative evaluation will be very important; we will also need summative data.
2. Initially, the program will probably be custodial, then there will be a later thrust toward child development.
3. We should determine whether the program is doing harm, at first.
4. We should look for indicators of harm, as flags, to help the system.
5. We can recommend approximately 12 months for tests and development of the program. We can circulate a paper to check other studies in order to make this an interagency effort.
6. She will send a draft summary to the participants for their comments; then send the final report to Federal agencies and many day care people.

"We have planned the designs we wanted; this has been a productive, tremendously successful meeting."

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT DAY CARE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

November 5 - 6, 1970
HEW South Building, Room 1319
Washington, D. C.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
OFFICE OF CHILD DEVELOPMENT DAY CARE EVALUATION CONFERENCE

November 5 - 6, 1970
HEW South Building, Room 1319
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Lois-ellin Datta, Chairman of the Conference opened the meeting with welcoming remarks, and statements concerning the objectives of the Conference. The task before the group was to do some long range thinking on day care evaluation. Specifically:

1. What are the questions which should be asked concerning the Family Assistance Program Day Care after one year, three years, and five years in terms of the program's accountability to Congress; Federal Level Program Operators; Local Program Operators; the Research Community; and the Parents (Consumers)? What is the order and what are the priorities which should be set concerning these questions; and how can they fit into a five year plan for evaluation?

2. What designs, methods, and measures are available for answering the priority questions; identify where these are limited, and make recommendations concerning steps that should be taken now for preparing for the future in these areas?

3. Given limited evaluation funds, what should be funded first (the order of priorities) and at what level?

Mr. Sam Granato, Chief of Interagency Liaison and Special Projects Division briefed the group on the objectives of the Family Assistance Program Day Care, and laid out some tentative plans concerning its operation. Essentially, the Office of Child Development would like to bring some order to the field of day care in terms of information on it as a national system of day care services. FAP will provide child care for those in manpower training programs and the working poor. It is not designed like Head Start in either its purposes or funding. The Administration of the program may be divided between two federal agencies. Within HEW, current plans include the division of responsibility between the Social and Rehabilitation Services (SRS) and the Office of Child Development (OCD). SRS will administer the bulk of the funds for the purchase of services (vendor payment program) and intake referrals handled by the social services agencies. OCD will develop policies and procedures, and administer funds for technical assistance, facility development, and program planning. The unknowns include the budget, what type of child care (may not be child development), priorities concerning who will be served first, and which agencies will have the major proportion of the money. The goal for this group is to plan an evaluation of the planning process(es), administrative process(es), and the effectiveness of the program.

Each State will have either a Prime Grantee (public or private non-profit agency) or State Welfare Agency whose function is to plan the program for that state. In areas where the population is 250,000 and over, this task may be assigned to a local Prime Grantee or local State Welfare Agency. Grants will be provided to the grantees in two phases. Phase I is a Planning Grant to cover six months to one year. The Phase II grant is made up of three accounts (administrative; grants--one-time seed money; vendor payment) and will be funded each year on the basis of an overall plan submitted.

The State Prime Grantee in Phase I will have the tasks (for all of the State except where local Prime Grantees have been set up) of:

A. Working with employment services and social services agencies to estimate the need for child care during the first three months (how many children will need day care); what child care resources are available to fulfill this need; if no resources are available, grants (seed money only for start up costs) will be provided to create capacity if none is available.

   1. When the capacity is 80% full, the Prime Grantee can determine the next block of capacity needed. It is a continuous planning task; and on-going task of development of capacity as need arises.

      During the first three month period, the center would be guaranteed 100% of funds for the 100% of slots they had agreed to reserve for FAP children. During the second three month period, the center would only be guaranteed 75% funds and slots reserved for FAP children would be reduced to 75%; thereafter there would be no guarantee.

      Point: This planning process should be evaluated.

   2. Grant writing would be reduced to one time funding. Day Care services become independent of Federal funds as the Federal Government only purchases services.

   3. The expansion of services is related to the availability of training and employment.

   4. Construction projects can be submitted to the national office. These will be ranked in terms of cost benefit (limited funds are available, though).

B. Being responsible for coordination of day care programs once they are available.

C. Being responsible for program quality. The Prime Grantee must certify services; establish a rate for them (Vendor payment); set a standardized cost (rates for service charged by individual day care centers cannot exceed the standard cost).

D. Handling administrative services such as fee collection.

E. Providing an area-wide in-service training for all staff of every certified program. Other training can be provided on a fee-basis. Some manpower training slots are available for day care recipients.

Point: Effectiveness of training needs to be evaluated.

F. Developing a plan for medical and dental resources in the local area and identify gaps.

Staff personnel will work with Prime Grantees during the first phase. If given Prime Grantee does not work out, another grantee can be selected (has to be a public or private non-profit agency approved by designated official ; some option may be open for Secretary to override selection).

Note: the parent becomes the true control of services.

The Office of Child Development wants to develop a workbook guide (standardized approach) to aiding Prime Grantees prepare estimates. May either be through the use of available data; or developing a better way. A survey of state licensing is being conducted; a goal is to get comparability across states. HEW plans to hold a National Conference for Day Care Licensing. The Interagency Day Care Standards are currently being revised.

Dr. Robert La Crosse, Jr. presented a suggested Outline of Questions one might anticipate each of the five audiences asking. Some of the questions might be resolved by administrative policy decisions, and others by research. Both types are included as policy decisions will have an impact on evaluation and research decisions. The questions as presented in the background paper for the conference were further defined and expanded as follows:

1. Congress

a. Do the mothers using the FAP day care component become gainfully employed?

1. What is meant by gainful employment? (Definition)

b. Are mothers at work with their children in day care a better situation than mothers at home caring for their own children?

1. Do women marry when day care is provided?

c. How does the FAP day care program fit into the larger social system?

1. Do other government agencies and other programs support them?

2. Is it 24-hour care? How do the hours affect job training and work shifts?

d. Does FAP reduce the welfare roles and decrease welfare problems?

1. Is one job training program effective in moving people out of FAP?

2. Are all eligible people being reached?

3. Is FAP, as executed, the same across all states?

4. Are all the forms of day care provided equally used and relevant?

5. Does the welfare birthrate go down?

2. Federal Level Program Administrators

A. What are the goals of the day care program?

1. Is it custodial? Is it child development? What does it mean?

2. Who controls the program? the curriculum? the goals?

B. Who controls program planning? (Federal or local level? Prime Grantee or local day care facility?)

C. How is FAP day care program eligibility to be determined? (What SES mix?).

D. What types of research should be done for the gathering of required information, and what types of research should generally be permitted?

E. What happens to the parental authority role when day care and job training are provided? (What is impact of delegation of child rearing?)

F. For whom is the program ineffective? Who is not being reached?

G. How is the unit of community for the day care component to be defined? (Area in local level has to be considered in relationship to logistics, transportation etc. for the parent and child.)

H. What happens to mothers who stay on welfare or continue under FAP without taking a job? (Ex. if a mother goes to college?)

I. Are the prime grantees and their delegate agencies expending funds according to the published guidelines and in a manner most beneficial to the populations served?

3. Prime Grantees and Their Delegate Agencies

A. How stable is FAP Day Care funding?

1. Will we have to spend half of each year writing a funding proposal for the next?

2. Will money be awarded on a per capita basis, or as needed?

B. What will the staff qualifications be? What is the staff ratio? (Note: with limited qualified staff now available, Day care will probably cost more than job training--a staff ratio of 1:7 is expensive. Who does the ratio include?)

C. Do I need to be licensed?

D. Who has responsibility for program quality--the administration or someone else?

E. How efficient does the program have to be?

F. Who will be responsible for parent education?

G. Who has authority over day care space?

H. Who controls the allotment of services?

4. Researchers

A. Are the FAP day care services available to be researched, and if so, what are the limitations, if any? (How is entry gained and and what restrictions are there on research?)

B. Areas

1. What is the impact on the child of the particular type of day care environment he occupies? (Ex. Montessori vs child care)

2. Does a sense of effectance in the community change for child or the parents (do adults gain a sense of power and control)?

3. Do the parents' feelings about confidence in their child's future increase? (Also danger aspect of devisiveness in nuclear family)

4. What is the most effective way to keep communication flowing between mother and day care worker? (if child is non-verbal, issue is continuity) (What happens to social controls of parent over child?)

5. Does the mother/child relationship improve, remain the same, or worsen after a child is put in day care?

6. What types or combinations of children are most benefited by what type of day care (in-home vs group care)?

7. What is a good infant curriculum beyond typical custodial care?

8. Is what is learned in day care by the child transferable to his own neighborhood? (has to develop relevant coping skills)

9. Do the center and the home match in values? If they differ, what is the impact on the parent/child relationship, and on the child's behavior?

10. Does day care weaken or strengthen the maternal bonds?

11. Does day care turn out children with any characteristic personality traits? (those with over 30 children may be bland in environment?

12. Do day care and non-day care children differ in later school performance?

13. What are disease patterns in day care situations? (How are the ill cared for?)

14. Is the child's IQ raised, or are his readiness skills enhanced, or are his cognitive capabilities augmented?

15. How do we train people to be effective with children?

5. Parents and Children

A. Will day care equal or better the care my child will get at home?

B. How will I know what is happening to him? (Communication)

C. Am I being a "good mother" by letting someone else rear my child? (home reared vs institutionalized care)

D. Will he learn anything?

E. How will what happens at the day care center relate or be relevant to what goes on at home or in the neighborhood?

F. Will he outgrow me?

G. Are these people qualified to take care of my child?

H. Is there other day care available so when I can't use FAP Day care anymore I can still keep my job?

I. Who will take care of him when he is really sick?

6. Potential Employers

7. Employee Unions

DISCUSSION

- These questions should be broken down in terms of long range and short range.

- The questions could be ordered as follows when listed in terms of the system of growth of day care:

  1. administrative efficiency and costs

  2. effects on people served

  3. the remainder are research questions

  Then let's consider:

  1. how do we assess the programs?

  2. what are the alternatives; what are the costs?

  3. what do they do to kids?

- There may be difficulties in separation of the questions in terms of evaluation of the program as a planning process vs the program as an effective day care delivery system

- Concern was expressed over difference between evaluation and research questions. Evaluation was defined as focusing on the program in terms of yielding information for policy decisions; and research was defined as raising questions that advance our knowledge. It was pointed out, however, that there is no conflict between the two in terms of a data base--the same data base can be applicable for all users.

- There is the need to develop a base of information that cuts across programs. That is, look at complexity of program mix; differences over different lengths of time; evaluate training and the relation of different kinds of training to different kinds of programs; is day care better or worse than other things; what are the alternative delivery systems that can be anticipated; may want to develop

comprehensive evaluation guidelines for use also by other agencies.

- Will it make a difference in the approach to the evaluation plan whether the program is custodial or child development. It was suggested it would not, that even custodial care will provide some education -- it is really the amount of funds available that will affect the degree of the educational component. However, we do have to look at what the program is setting out to do.

- It is important to look at programs in terms of family development rather than child development.

- Input should be obtained from the children and the parents and taken into consideration during all stages of the program.

- The prime consumer will be Congress. Their main question will be whether mothers get off welfare and go to work. This is an impossible question for this group to build into the evaluation plan of the day-care component--whether the mother goes to work or not is related to issues beyond the control of the day care centers.

- Costs more to obtain evaluation data at beginning of program in order to make decisions than to obtain data after program has begun--the use to which the evaluation data is put makes a difference in terms of developing the evaluation.

- Data processing system has to be built in early; the way the program is administered is also the way to collect the data (checks and budgets etc). Identify child on tape--program has to account for his dollars. Determine what information you want for that child on tape now.

- Evaluation budget is usually 1/2 of 1% to 3% of total budget of program; plans and recommendations by this group may impact budget, however.

It was then suggested that the group consider developing an evaluation plan in terms of the following categories:

1. Administrative
   a. efficiency (auspices; structure)
   b. cost (program and staff)
2. Quality (conformance to standards, goals)
3. Inputs (programs, parents, children)
4. Effects (children, parents, institutions)
5. Acceptance by Consumers
   a. parents and children (turnover)
   b. staff (stability)
   c. community (local share; coordination)
   d. employers

e. professional community
f. public officials
g. general public

One should consider the technical means by which to collect data on these, and structure the technology to do it.

The participants then decided to divide the categories and split into two discussion groups for the afternoon session. Each group would suggest questions they would ask and to which kinds of audiences these would be most important. One Subgroup chaired by Dr. Joe Wholly would address itself to Administration and Quality. The other Subgroup chaired by Dr. Robert La Crosse, Jr. would cover Inputs and Effects.

The afternoon session was devoted to the group discussions. The Chairmen reported back to the conference participants the following day.

Dr. Lois-ellin Datta opened the Friday morning session; and asked the group to begin by addressing itself to the question of measurement and design. The goal is to make specific recommendations for action to OEO, OCD, and ASPE. For example, if IQ tests are not recommended, what is recommended as an alternative? Further, if facilities are a problem, what specific actions would the group recommend be taken.

Dr. Francis Palmer then presented a summary of some thoughts on evaluation as outlined in the paper on Evaluation of Day Care Centers: Summative and Formative as prepared by Francis H. Palmer; Courtney Cazden; and Joseph Glick for OEO.

A. Summative Evaluation:

Is "public."; and performed in response to people from outside of the operating program. It is usually cross-regional, post-hoc, and descriptive. It has taken the approach of defending the program: and communicating what happened. It has usually turned out badly (Ex. Westinghouse Report); and is threatening to local programs. Outsiders can be unbiased, well-trained, but they cannot understand the program like the people in it. One cannot design a summative evaluation that is applicable for everyone and all programs. Note: Measures have to reflect what a specific program is designed to do. If more summative evaluations identified programs where increases occured and looked at those where deficits occured, then one might learn something. Control groups are possible. Standard measures should be used: important to have for communities to be compared. Much criticism of these though.

Selection of standard measures is a difficult task; and caution should be exercised in their selection. It is important to ensure use of.

1. Measures that are not influenced by cultural differences.

Many like the Stanford-Binet and Weschler magnify social

class differences and are almost always used without adequate preparation of the child.

This is related to the difference between capability and performance, and between process and achievement. The key concern is really to determine what the child knows. A test of delayed response is less influenced by social class than many other measures.

2. Measures that are not highly sensitive to different examiners.

B. Formative Evaluation:

Is "private", and performed by people in the program. Local programs can continue to evaluate themselves compared to some kind of plan (structure). More important in terms of increasing efficiency and improving programs. Can be done like APOLLO. Provides immediate feedback. More benefits to what program will do for the children. Problem in self-evaluation aspects-local programs will make mistakes but let them--they will learn this way.

For it to work:

1. get people to accept the concept--group has to ask questions about itself; has to want information

2. goals of program have to be specific
   Recommendation: that OCD encourage programs to specify and set their own goals

3. have to have evaluation plan and design

Chance to develop control group is nearly impossible. But can have within program design. Program can be encouraged to see if a change would work (Ex. vary staff ratio and hours of interaction and compare for differences in two groups). Can also have before and after design (Ex. change in library location to see if more mothers take books out).

Recommendation: That OCD think in terms of summative evaluation but emphasize formative evaluation

DISCUSSION:

It was suggested that FAP Day Care Evaluation Plan not take the positive posture because it sets up positive expectations. Rather, given basically custodial care, set out to show no damage was done as compared to a control group. Construct a reporting system to find out if children are being hurt. Set up a Checklist of simple measures by which children in all programs can be measured. For example by normative goals such as reaching a certain height by a certain time. Set this model up nationally, and let centers set up what they want. If some centers are not up to par on this, will send in assistance; if assistance doesn't work, will change center more radically. It is easier to get agreement on what hurts a child than on what helps a child.

Measures:

1. no or insufficient increases in height and weight in terms of norms
2. increase in respiratory diseases among staff and children
3. rate and frequency of certain kinds of diseases
4. sample vocabulary size (can define by sub-groups)
5. age of toilet training
6. age of weaning
7. muscle tone
8. vision
9. hearing
10. curiosity
11. number of hours a day spent crying
12. indicators re intellectual growth

Want measures that can easily be used by nurse, teacher, or para-professionals after a training session; use measures a trained day care operator can use. Point out to operator that environment will make a difference--assume no environment is a blank and procede from there. Operators are more likely to accept this form of evaluation if the consequences of reporting what will hurt will help make it work--that is, they will get immediate feedback for modifying program, also get technical assistance to help them--this is much better than feeling punitive action will result.

Develop a self-evaluation packet for local units and give national norms to them.

This can be part of planning process which is continuous; and can still have 1, 3, and 5 year plan. Best to get entry level behavior at Day 1, though, so centers can try out curriculum and change on a day-to-day basis and modify program. Have them indicate change that took place, so know why change took place.

Ask centers every six months about what didn't work so it can be shared with other centers.

This is a new way for people to operate--using feedback. Should try this Evaluation plan out here in D.C. on pilot basis in next three months. It will be a major selling job to centers to use this form of evaluation; will have to determine means of communicating to staff what it is.

Recommend that approach be taken in Grant Application that "this is a joint enterprise. We are all in this together," rather than approach of "show me you can do it."

Develop forms that all levels needing information can use. May send in on weekly basis. Have system to reward good reporting. Really have to have people, first, then have program, so is a tracking system rather than a reporting system. Is process based--program is an outcome.

Have to also track operators, children and families, and staff at exit and follow them up to see what happens. Continuity of care to child is important. Have to approach staff turnover with caution though. Other indicators may show up before this such as tardiness, absenteeism. However, if people leave with confidence they didn't have before, this is good. Could mean program is understaffed, staff work long hours, and related in general to working conditions. Staff turnover not high in all places so can compare centers to see why in some places and not in others. Have centers consider (or see if they have) alternatives when staff is over worked such as use of volunteers and split hours.

Have side-benefit in training of staff, parents, and community to operate this way. Use of skills in self-evaluation are transferable. Money for training local persons for formative evaluation can be obtained from Research, Evaluation and training budget.

Note: In custodial care, staff may have nothing to do (or feel they don't), an Evaluation plan will give them something to do and help the program.

Also look at institutional effect of whole program. Want to know what attitude public has now. What do people think of prime grantee (like a CAP)? Is this a new family style for poor? How do poor see this program? What is effect on father? Must be sensitive to these issues. What will institutional impact be (of interest to Congress)--economic in local area (ex. food services, etc.).

Point: 90% of this discussion is really formative evaluation; and the group has to discuss summative evaluation. Some of the group still felt that this could be used for summative evaluation if there is an adequate national reporting system. For example, so many kids were brought to normative level as a result of the program. Will also have the data to say that in Community X where extra money was used or help was available; this much more was accomplished. Show these comparisons to Congress and ask if they are satisfied. Take the offensive for good day care rather than be on the defensive.

It was pointed out that the above suggestions (Approach) are really intermediate between formative and summative, because the above is still being superimposed on the program. It was recommended that heavy emphasis be placed on formative evaluation--that centers be encouraged to do it if they ask for it. Then still develop a summative evaluation for Congress.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Training program include development of skills for self-evaluation. Develop a checklist for every guideline that staff can use.

2. That OCD search for newer and better ways of using people.

3. That evaluation funds be spent on prime grantee and day care staff to come up with formative evaluation plan. Will have to take this approach for administrative evaluation (process of funding).

4. That local centers be encouraged to use measures of affect in formative evaluation but do not use these for summative evaluation. They should also consider durability and ongitudinal aspects of affects over 1 year, and three years.

5. Take a Developmental List of Measures and try out in pilot study now (Possible Cost $150,000-$200,000).

   A. look for those measures least susceptible to cultural bias, and examiner influence

   B. determine acceptability of measures by day care operators

6. Conduct a study of day care operators now in existence to determine what their signals are (for indicators of harm to kids). Would also give clues to potential for formative evaluation. Use several methods here such as critical incidents techniques (good and bad things); observations; and surveys.

Dr. Datta summarized the discussion by stating that given custodial care, the group was recommending a two stage evaluation process.

During the first stage (the first few years) evaluation would be geared toward developing parallel indicators relating to children and administration with the goals of:

1. no harm to children by program

2. funds are being managed and spent well

The second stage will focus on developmental aspects

It was further pointed out that it was not really useful for the group to discuss specific measures here. Rather the strategies are being developed by the group by which specific measures should be judged. A summary will be circulated to the participants for their comments.

The afternoon session opened with presentations by Dr. Joe Wholly and Dr. Robert La Crosse, Jr., Chairmen of the Thursday afternoon discussion groups.

Dr. Wholly, in summary, pointed out that most of the discussion of the subgroup on Administration and Quality had emphasized monitoring of programs, the development of a routine reporting system and use of review group of experts making site visits, and little emphasis on studies for Congress. The highlight memo was presented to the group and has been expanded below according to the discussion:

A. Studies recommended for inclusion in FAP Day Care Evaluation Plan

This section briefly outlines the evaluation studies we recommended, using the classification scheme found in Federal Evaluation Policy. Studies are listed in the order in which they were first discussed.

1. Program strategy evaluations (for Federal program administrators and Congress)

A series of studies should be done examining what differences are made by the type of prime grantee (and what differences are made by the type of delegate agency) selected. Also look at make-up of grantee mix of 1/3, 1/3, 1/3 vs. other); and differences between state and local prime grantees. These questions should certainly be investigated in the FAP pilot efforts, which should include systematic planned variation of the types of delegate agencies selected, in order to maximize the chance of useful evaluation. (The FAP pilot efforts will also be the best opportunities to investigate whether FAP day care actually helps people to get to work.

2. Monitoring of the interrelationships between the Employment Service and the Social Services agencies

Who does what? what relationships are there to employers and to unions? what day care center licensure activities are carried on? what is the impact of multiple licensing? what is length of time to get licensed?

3. Monitoring of the planning process (for Federal program administrators, for prime grantees, and for possible vendors)

Are people caught in an endless cycle of proposal writing? Is the prime grantee succeeding in encouraging proven performers to expand their day care operations? What risk-taking is going on (new day care centers formed)? (How flexible is Prime Grantee in arranging day care facilities or re-arranging)? What confidence is there at prime grantee/delegate agency level to expand operations?

Comparisons should be made among demand for day care services, Employment Service estimates of demand, and supply. (HEW should provide standard census-type data to all prime grantees.)

4. Monitoring of the quality of delegate agency operations (for prime grantees, for parents, for State/local public officials, and for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

a. "Hard data." The same data system should serve administrative and evaluative functions. 1/ Delegate agencies should report "actual" vs. "planned" figures, in at least the following categories (perhaps for three-month periods): number of children enrolled, cost, cost per child, measures of continuity of care, proportion of FAP capacity filled with FAP children. (Similar data should be reported by local Employment Service and Social Services agencies, to allow cross-checks.) Have built into the system the means to compare actual vs. planned figures.

b. Site visits. Examination of obstacles to expansion of operations, amount of red tape, problems in operations, degree to which existing services are satisfactory to the parents. 2/ The site visits should include audits of the information reported in 4.a, on a random basis.

The monitoring operations should be used to determine, among other things, which delegate agencies need training and technical assistance. Determination of shortage of staff. Define criteria for Training and Technical assistance. Have a national base of consultants (experts) for this to draw upon. Have them also identify and look at those delegate agencies with good technical aspects who don't need training and assistance to see why they were different from those who did.

Output indicators that should be examined in the monitoring operations include staff turnover, child turnover, and cost per child.

5. Monitoring and comparative rating of the activities of prime grantees (for Federal program administrators)

Monitoring should be done on a regional basis--and on a national basis when necessary to ensure that the operations of comparable prime grantees are in fact compared.

Prime Grantee Review Committees should be established, at OCD and HEW regional office levels, to pick out the best and the worst among each group of comparable prime grantees. 3/ (Within each group of comparable prime grantees,) the best prime grantees should be given commendations by the Secretary and given special consideration when it comes to handing out

---

1/ Assignment and use of unique identifying numbers to each parent and each child (for check-writing purposes) will facilitate evaluation studies. Use of standardized billing system; social worker as data collector.

2/ Monitoring should include collection of information from consumers and former consumers of the services by phone calls (e.g., "How long were you on the waiting list?" how many options were available; how far to travel, how satisfied with service.)

3/ In some cases, it may be necessary to cross regional boundaries in order to get a group of prime grantees that are similar enough to make it fair to compare them.

discretionary funds. (e.g., for construction of day care facilities)--the worst prime grantees should be given warnings, and if necessary ultimately relieved of their duties. Prime grantees should be given in advance clear statements of the criteria on which they will be rated--and a range of ratings should be possible so that prime grantees can know when they are in or near the danger zone. Make guidelines measurable and enforceable. (A plea was made: that the monotirong/rating criteria be such that OCD could actually measure performance and require good performance.)

The monitoring and rating operations should also be used to determine which prime grantees need training and technical assistance.

Follow-up studies should be made on delegate agencies to see why some went out of business, some failed to expand, and some did expand. Who filled to capacity and who didn't? A question to be examined: is there a quick turnover among delegate agencies, in order to collect the 100% and then 75% guarantees from the grant account?

6. Research into incentive systems

OCD should conduct a study to determine what "incentives" are to be provided (e.g., to prime grantees) and whether these "incentives" actually do provide incentives for positive behavior. What in the system is negative reinforcer? Does parent choice of vendor really operate; does some other factor operate; does no factor operate?"

B. Priorities

There was general agreement that monitoring is important early in the life of the program.

Day Care Facilities are a major issue.

This group is concerned that this was not a priority in the program; we cannot have a program to evaluate if there are no facilities.

1. May have to increase funds for construction
2. May have to revise current legislation to take advantage of existing facilities (change licensing, zoning etc.)
3. New legislation to require all new companies to build day care facilities as part of their structure.

DISCUSSION:

- data processing needs have to be spelled out specifically so that whatever automated techniques are needed can be investigated early to see how they can fit into the operation.

- concern over issue of funds for construction facilities led to possible use of Savings and Loan or Insurance Trusts as sources of guarantees for construction. Mr. Neil Gibson will submit a statement to Dr. Lois-ellin Datta and Mr. Sam Granato on this

- have to communicate results of site visits to program operators. may even want to use operators as site visitors.

Dr. Robert La Crosse Jr. presented an overview of the discussion from the Subgroup on Inputs and Effects. They focused on the preschool child and looked at components of curriculum. They devised a set of questions on the child, staff, parents, community. They made the assumption that each consumer group specifies their own goals: how are they arrived at; and how are they met? Each question becomes the goal.

Child

1. Nutrition
   a. is diet adequate?
2. Health care
   a. is medical/dental/ and mental health adequate?
   b. do the day care programs create unique health problems?
   c. how frequent are visits to private physicians?
   d. are referrals adequate?
3. Cognitive, social, emotional - is child offered opportunity to:
   a. develop ability to communicate (oral, non-verbal, and graphic means)?
   b. have individual interaction with adults? other children?
   c. music and aesthetic pursuits
   d. social responsibility
   e. political (neighborhood) and leadership and coping skills
   f. try styles of analysis and synthesis
   g. adapt to new situations
   h. organize and manage information
   i. privacy and rest
   j. growth in all are s

4. Given all of the above
   a. are individual differences taken into account
   b. are cultural, and linguistic concerns of consumer taken into consideration
   c. how are these related to social, emotional, and affective development

Parents

1. Does program strengthen, support, and compliment (or not harm) family role?

2. Have adequate communication with staff
   a. is participation explained
   b. are activities child involved in during day described

3. Community resources and activities
4. Does program support parent group
5. are methods given on child care supported at home
6. is father involved
7. are all children in one center

Staff

1. adequate training supervisor
2. preservice training provided
3. in-service training include mothers and others--are a variety of programs introduced
4. stable--who leaves (characteristics)
5. continuity of child care provided
6. adequate relief given to staff
7. career development
8. male staff involvement
9. reflect cultural input at all levels
10. formative evaluation for staff, parents, and children
11. ripple effect to other children
12. ethics training
13. share information
14. transfer to community
15. training care for illness
16. how does day care relate to other programs for family development

Community

1. how does it react
2. how does it support the program
3. provide volunteers
4. female employees
5. FAP impact on other institutions in community
6. FAP participation in comprehensive child development programs in community

DISCUSSION:

- Query: Can we not fit these into Dr. Palmer's two forms of evaluation; determine the short range and long range questions; and also have the information Congress will need.

The group thought a report should be structured around these; and then needs for measures determined.

It was suggested that the group look at these in terms of two system as a facilitative mechanism:

Administrative/Indicators	Formative/Clinical
Status	Goal formulation
Program Components	program planning
Damage	Reporting, Feedback
Technical Assistance/Information	Dissemination
	Supplementary Services
	(program variability)
Longitudinal	Quality
Monitoring	
Accountability	Acceptability

Data Processing
Assessment of what it means
Dissemination of
experiences

However, before decisions could be made on such a chart, the group thought there were other tasks before them.

The two types of evaluation were further spelled out as follows:

1. Summative - will look at the program in terms of is it doing good for the child in comparison to the child in the home. This gets at the issue of harm (Ex. Is there music in the center? There may be a television or radio at home and nothing in the center).

   It is important to determine the minimum list of things to be looked at. The original demands on the centers for information will be so great-- don't want to overload them.

   If the program is "custodial" -- are there five similar goals across programs. Why not set a limit to six goals to be looked at. These will probably shift frequently and we want to pick these up in system.

   This may mean requiring centers to have certain goals. Might build in three things centers have to have not to damage children. Have minimum services listed on form for program budget and formula to get there; or justify why not there. Leave rest open for centers. Once beyond basics, will get beautiful inputs on goals.

   Caution should be exercised in developing a list of what may cause damage to children. For example, while everyone would agree that psychotic behavior is damaging; the definition of psychotic is a problem.

In developing the list, a distinction has to be made in terms of national and local indicators. One approach to developing a list is to establish a continuum. Have a zero line--that to the right is good; that to left is bad; as zero line is approached from side of what is good, there is a danger zone.

This group should define what is damaging to children and "what is good" for children and make recommendations (such as looking for new developmental measures). Consider establishing ten (10) areas of danger.

The list developed by the group could be sent to the Federal Interagency Committee developing the guidelines and have the guidelines support these. For example, put in guidelines, the amount of nutrition a child should receive. In reference to the guidelines, concern was expressed over the staff to child ratio recommended; it was suggested it may be better to keep this loose.

In recommending the preparation of a document for the committee it was added that a preamble should be included on the order of the following:

> If day care is going the way it looks like it is, in the next ten years, it will be a unique social change agent. This is unique in the history of education in this country. Guidelines or list becomes what is desirable for a whole generation of children. We don't want uniformity....

2. Formative will take the approach of how to make the program better. Is the program doing good in comparison to the ideal for children. It will provide the means for making program personnel think about the program. Here, can get away from the concerns over "measurements" -- may look at 30 things and be flexible. Whatever "measurements" are used, centers should not feel they will be beaten over the head with them.

It was also pointed out that if OCD is really supporting the development of a local program (where it defines its goals and achieves them), OCD will have to come to its defense if achievement of the goals upsets a Congressman.

- A summary of this meeting should be prepared. Then OCD should come up with a 1, 3, and 5 year evaluation plan. A contract should be let to further refine this plan. The discussion here is really quite broad. OCD should break this down further. A contractor should study it and submit recommendations; then the plan should be implemented on a pilot project; from which further refinement will result.

- At this point, the goals of evaluation can be viewed in three stages:

  1. determine information we need through the piloting of measurements

2. obtain minimum information for summative evaluation pointing out no harm to children is taking place

3. given time, work on efforts to show more can be done through the formative evaluation concept as well as additional funds for development of each component.

- The following list of preparatory steps toward an evaluation system was proposed.

1. Identification of indicators of damage
   A. get professional group to develop this
   B. Make sure these are manageable and observable
   C. Also want baseline data--to know why children are or are not accepted into program as well as why they leave. (are the disturbed screened out)
2. Identification of measures of development and need
   A. measures and constraints on them
3. Identification of external system
   A. mechanisms to handle data
4. Field test of formative system
5. Field test of report system
6. Field test status report
7. Field test of administrative process evaluation report
8. Design auspices variability study
9. Finance normative studies for indicators (updating existing norms)
10. Devise longitudinal study system (build in first place)
11. Devise measures of program acceptance (consumers)
12. Devise system for study of community, family and institutional effects.
13. Set up pre-service, in-service training program- May also have to have a "Resource and Demonstration Center" for day care operators in Regions. Ex. North Carolina. Can't just write in manual--have to have place to demonstrate different curricula.

A time table has to be developed for these. Also each category has to be spelled out further--would take a group for each one.

- The above were broken down into five basic studies with length of time and cost for each estimated:

1. Pilot study of a formative evaluation

   a. about 12 months for one system; would want to look at four or five models to take into consideration local differences and how long it took to communicate the concept.

   b. approximate cost of $100,000

2. Development of a minimum management information system.

   a. about 3 months to design one for picking up summative data

   b. about $25,000 - $40,000

3. Studies to identify indicators of damage for summative evaluation. This includes a study of the measures for children 3 - 6 years old to screen out for examiner effects (sex, ethnicity, and language), and cultural bias; and to determine the acceptability of these measures to the program operators.

   a. minimum of 6 months probably 1 year. It may be possible to fit these into other ongoing studies

   b. Approximately $200,000 ($45,000 for each variable)

4. Field tryout of Summative System (once indicators study completed).

   a. will know more about the length from the other study. Institutional arrangements will be the problem; also have to include training for program improvement. Approximately 1 year (3 months for training; six months for field trial; 3 months at end).

   b. approximately $400,000 (should be tried out in a variety of day care programs)

5. Administrative Facilities (process evaluation--what it takes before the door opens)

   a. will have to look at Prime grantee and delegate agency. Will need a fund of information on lack of buildings

   b. approximately $75,000

The total amount may well come to over one million dollars.

o In summary, there are three kinds of evaluation under consideration:

   1. Formative (tremendously important for program quality and long range)

   2. Summative (given initial funds for custodial care, will look at any evidence of program doing harm to child rather than comparing to an ideal)

   3. Developmental (be in with indicators of harm; technical assistance will follow from this; becomes summative and formative).

It will take about 12 months to prepare for this plan.

- The first stage will be the preparation of a document from this meeting to include the following parts:

  1. Preamble

  2. Conceptual statement (questions for different groups)

  3. Strategy (Evaluation)

  4. Special programmatic recommendations for day care evaluation

  5. Areas for others to be concerned over (those areas for which this group is not primarily responsible for, but wants to make certain someone is looking into them)

     Example:

     Administrative problems, facilities and relationships;

     Job training program, and forecasting; Staff Training; Licensing

The draft paper will be prepared and sent out to each of the participants for revisions. Then a final paper will be submitted to other agencies, and circulated widely to day care people for comment.

Reporter:
Barbara Bates, Research Analyst
Research & Evaluation Division
Office of Child Development
400-6th Street, S.W.

APPENDIX E

PROJECTS IN DAY CARE OF THE
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

1970 - 1971

Project Title	Contractor/Grantee	Description of Project
1. Day care Survey and Analysis $406,624	Westinghouse Learning Corporation 5801 Annapolis Road Bladensburg, Maryland 20710 Jody R. Johns (301) 799-3150	A comprehensive survey which will (1) develop a compendium of information on Federal day care financial assistance programs, state licensing practices, and notable State and local programs, (2) undertake six in-depth local community case studies, (3) survey local day care programs representing a variety of financial support patterns and types of programs, (4) survey users of day care, and (5) make projections of national needs for day care.
2. State of the Arts Study $136,607	OEO/PRE 1200 19th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20506 Dr. Edith Grotbert (202) 382-6918	Designed to organize what is already known about pre-school day care; the study will cover child development needs; program content; auxiliary services; teacher-child-parent-program interactions; problems of physical facilities, financing, and administration; and measurement and evaluation.

Project Title	Contractor/Grantee	Description of Project (2)
3. Day Care Workshop funds transferred to HEW/OCD $400,000 ($250,000 allocated by OCD)		A two-week workshop designed to produce a series of publications and audio-visual materials on (1) effective curriculum models for use in FAP and other Federally funded day care programs, (2) principals for the operation of child care programs, (3) policy criteria for utilization of day care services, (4) methods of training child care personnel.
4. Policy Studies Group $434,948	Institute for Inderdisciplinary Studies 1800 Chicago Avenue Minneapolis, Minnesota 55404 Seldon P. Todd, Marvin Meyers, Steve Johnson (612) 333-4251	Establishment of a Day Care Policy Studies Group in order to analyze key policy issues related to Federal day care assistance programs affecting poor people, using existing information and information to be developed by the PSG and other organizations, and to present findings and relevant information on these issues to OEO.
5. Evaluation of Exemplary Day Care Centers $327,172	ABT Associates 55 Wheeler Street Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 Stephen Fitzsimmons (617) 492-7100	A qualititative assessment of approximately forty day care centers to identify a range of quality models of day care centers and assess the impact that these quality centers have on children, their mothers and families.
6. Model Family Assistance Plan Child Care Service System $1,034,332 ($755,000 allocated by HEW)	funds transferred to HEW/OCD grant made to Vermont State Economic Opportunity Office HEW/FAP Joseph Corbett (202) 362-4040 Ext. 7318	Simulation of the proposed Family Assistance Plan in order to resolve the many problems attending the integration of FAP with the State programs to have a model Federal-State available to serve as a basis for future discussions with various states.

Project Title	Contractor/Grantee	Description of Project (3)
7. Impact Feasibility/Design Study $96,796	Center for the Study of Public Policy Read House Farwell Drive Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138 George Thomas (617) 495-4914	Determine the feasibility of and formulate an appropriate demonstration design for an Impact Experiment to simulate comprehensive Federally-supported day care in two communities using an entitlement system in one and a project grant system in the other.
8. Evaluation of National Capitol Area Day Care Center Project	Training Research and Development, Incorporated 918 Tenth Street, N.W. 20036 1025 Connecticut Avenue Dr. Harvey Block 293-2571	Study of the effectiveness of programmed instructional techniques on reading and cognitive development on the day care center population by the comparison of phonics, ITA and Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI) methods of instruction and the cost of effectiveness of these approaches within the program.
9. Licensing Study	HEW-OCD Consulting Services Corp. Social and Admin. Systems and Services 1602 Tower Building Seattle, Washington 98101 Jack Harbeston (202) 682-7681	Assessment of present state licensing codes and practices and development of model licensing codes to assist in implementation of policy and legislative changes.

For further Information contact:

Mr. Joseph Howell,
Director
Human Resources Div.
Office of Program
Development
OEO - Room 600
1832 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20506
(202) 382-2051

SOME OTHER DAY-CARE RELATED PROJECTS

OFFICE OF EDUCATION (K. Henry; Dr. Joan Duval)

Mrs. Phyllis Click Center for Early Education 563 North Alfred Street Los Angeles, California 90048	A program for developing effective leadership in day care (1007 ECH; 4-C)
Dr. John Kosoloski Pennsylvania Dept of Education Commonwealth Avenue Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126	State Interagency 4-C Manpower Training Project (1055 ECH; 4-C)
Mrs. Audrey Blackwell Colorado Dept. of Education Colfax at Sherman Denver, Colorado 30203	A program to provide for coordinations of training of workers in early childhood education (1010 ECH;4-C)
Dr. Carl D. Smith Psychology Department Salem State College Lafayette Street Salem, Massachusetts 01970	Preprofessional day call training institute (1031 ECH;4-C)
Dr. Allen J. Matheine Community Services Division Flint Community Jr. College 1401 E. Court Street Flint, Michigan 48503	Child Care Center Instructional Program (1031 ECH;4-C)
Mrs. Geraldine Schermoley Penn Valley Com. College 560 Westport Road Kansas City, Missouri 64111	Penn Valley Day Care Project (1038 ECH; 4-C)
Mrs. Lucille Roch and Mrs. Felicidad McDaniel San Antonio College 1300 San Pedro Avenue San Antonio, Texas 78212	A two-year training program for child day care teacher associates (1064 ECH; 4-C)

Mrs. Aurelia Strupp
Home Management Department
University of Wisconsin
Madison,Milwaukee Extension
147 Home Economic Building
Madison, Wisconsin 53706

Wisconsin 4-C Pilot Training
Project (1073 ECH; 4-C)

OTHER FEDERAL AND NON-FEDERAL PROJECTS

1. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is funding a study in Pasadena concerned with a resident housing complex, including a day care center and shopping center.

2. Mr. Jesse Davis (Manpower Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1111 - 20th Street, N.W., Room 518, Washington, D.C. 20036) reports a collaborative three-state study being conducted in the schools of social work of the University of Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit. The studies include questionnaire investigations of decision-making in WIN, e.g., mothers' attitudes toward day care, reported benefits and problems.

3. Dr. Irving Lazar (Appalachian Regional Commission, 1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.) directs some large-scale day care demonstration projects.

4. Dr. Nancy Travis (Donner Foundation, 130 - 6th Street, N.W., Atlanta, George 30313) is directing some large-scale day care demonstration studies.

5. The State Department of Education (Sacramento, California; John Weber) operates day care centers for school-age children throughout the state of California.

6. The state of Massachusetts is finding an 18-month study of day care legislative needs.

7. Dr. Martin Wollins (Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720), NIMH grant, "Child Care in Cross-Cultural Perspective" for the "evaluation of group care for children in several countries..."

8. Dr. Richard Famaft (Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.) An "Assessment of day care services and needs at the community level".

9. Dr. Lilian Katz ERIC/ECE Clearinghouse, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois). Bibliographies and copies of completed day care studies.[1]

---

1. From a survey prepared by Evelyn Lett, Social and Rehabilitation Services, December 1970.